Christ. 6. That all that communicate not with them, are cut off from Christ, being guilty of Schism, which is as damning as Adultery and Murder. 7. That Rulers should use such——I need not tell you how. All this every ignorant person must have Learning enough to know, or else take it on their words, and so trust them in the dark with their salvation. For my part, I have not knowledg enough to make me capable of their communion in this sence, tho I constantly joyn with them in Worship, and oft in Sacrament, and tho I peaceably submit to all their Courts, Dioceſans, and Lay-Key-bearers, and canonical Executions, which I cannot approve: And yet while many that take them for no lawful Paſtors, submit to the Magiſtrates command in joyning corporally with them: mental Separatiſts are local communicants, and mental communicants that prefer what they judg better without unchurching them, are counted Separatiſts. Becauſe I abhor confining the church of Christ to a Sect, and will not renounce love and communion with all true Christians on Earth for a Sect, I here offer their Reaſons and mine to tryal.

D
B 1206
228987

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE
HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION

Christ. 6. That all that communicate not with them, are cut off from Christ, being guilty of Schism, which is as damning as Adultery and Murder. 7. That Rulers should use such——I need not tell you how. All this every ignorant person must have Learning enough to know, or else take it on their words, and so trust them in the dark with their salvation. For my part, I have not knowledg enough to make me capable of their communion in this sence, tho I constantly joyn with them in Worship, and oft in Sacrament, and tho I peaceably submit to all their Courts, Dioceſans, and Lay-Key-bearers, and canonical Executions, which I cannot approve: And yet while many that take them for no lawful Paſtors, submit to the Magiſtrates command in joyning corporally with them: mental Separatiſts are local communicants, and mental communicants that prefer what they judg better without unchurching them, are counted Separatiſts. Becauſe I abhor confining the church of Christ to a Sect, and will not renounce love and communion with all true Christians on Earth for a Sect, I here offer their Reaſons and mine to tryal.

D
B 1206
228987

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE
HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION

THE DANGEROUS

SCHISMATICK

CLEARLY DETECTED, and fully CONFUTED;

For the Saving of a Diſtracted Nation from that which would deſtroy Chriſtian Love and Unity.

Occaſioned by a Reſolver of Three CASES about CHURCH-COMMUNION.

By *RICHARD BAXTER* a Catholique Chriſtian, who is againſt confining Chriſtian Love and Communion to any Sect how Great ſoever.

Mark 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved.*
John 13. 35. *By this ſhall all men know you are my Diſciples, if ye have Love one to another.*
1 John 4. 16. *He that dwelleth in Love dwelleth in God, and he in him.*
Rom. 14. 1. 17, 18. *Him that is weak in the Faith receive ye, but not to doubtful Diſputations: for the Kingdom of God is not Meat and Drink, but Righteouſneſs and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghoſt: for he that in theſe things ſerveth Chriſt, is acceptable to God, and approved of Men.*

LONDON,
Printed for *Thomas Parkhurſt* at the *Bible* and *Three Crowns* at the lower end of *Cheapſide* near *Mercers-Chappel*, 1683.

The Engliſh Schiſmatick, *detected and confuted: Occaſioned by a Reſolver of Caſes about* Church Communion.

CHAP. I.

SAITH THE RESOLVER,

§. 1. *THE Church is a Body or ſociety of men ſeparated from the reſt of the World, and united to God and to themſelves by a Divine Covenant.*

A. He ſaith this is the plaineſt deſcription he can give: That is not the fault of his Auditors or Readers. 1. As to the *Genus*, a Community of equals without Rulers is a body: but I ſuppoſe he meaneth not ſuch. 2. Is it enough that it be of *Men?* ſure now they ſhould be *Chriſtians?* 3. Many are *ſeparated from the reſt of the World, ſecundum quid*, that are no Chriſtians; ſome in one reſpect and ſome in another, and none in all reſpects. 4. *United to God*, is an ambiguous word, no *Creature* is *United* to him perfectly ſo as to be thereby what he is, *God*, in the created Nature. Only Chriſt is united to him Hypoſtatically in his created Nature. All are ſo far united to him in natural being, as that in him they live and move and have their being: And the Nature of man is one ſort of his Image: All things are united to him as effects to their conſtant efficient. The Church ſhould not be defined without any mention of Chriſt: The Churches Union with God is by Chriſt. 5. Chriſt himſelf as Head is an eſſential part of the Church, and ſhould not be left out of a Definition, thô the meer Body may in common ſpeech be called *the Church*, as the People may be called *a Kingdom*. 6. Will any *Divine Covenant* ſerve? or muſt it not be only the Baptiſmal Covenant? 7. Is it called *Divine* only as *made by God*, or as *commanded by God and made by Man*, or as mutual? Certainly Gods Law and offered or Conditional Promiſe is moſt frequently called *His Covenant* in Scripture; and this uniteth not men to God, till they conſent and Covenant with him. Their own *Covenant Act* is neceſſary hereto: And that is a *Divine Covenant*, only as commanded, and *accepted* and done by Gods aſſiſting Grace. 8. The form of a Church is Relative, and the *Terminus* is eſſential to a Relation. It is no definition that hath not the End

of the Aſſociation: Therefore this is none at all; and ſo the beginning tells us what to expect.

This deſcription hath nothing in it but what may agree to divers forms of Society, and ſo hath not the form of a Church: And if he intended not a Definition, but a looſe deſcription, I would a defining Doctor had had the Chair, during this controverſie.

Let us try this deſcription upon a *Mahometan* Kingdom, Army, or Navy, or ſuppoſe them meer Deiſts.

1. Such a Kingdom, Army, or Navy may be a Society. 2. Of Men. 3. Separated from the reſt of the World *ſecundum quid & ad hoc* (and none are ſeparated from it *ſimpliciter & ad omnia*: e. g. No man is ſeparated from the common humanity; No Deiſt from any but Atheiſts, and no Chriſtian in believing a God and the Law of Nature and Nations.) 4. They are *United to God* ſo far as *owning a God* and Worſhipping him amounts to, beſides the Union of the Creature with the Creator in whom he liveth, &c. And no unregenerate ungodly Chriſtian is united to him ſavingly. 5. They are united among themſelves. 6. This is by a Covenant: 7. And by a Covenant Divine, as to *command*, *approbation* and *object*. It is God that they Covenant to own and obey: The common Profeſſion of the *Mahometans*, is, *There is one God, and* Mahomet *is his Prophet*. It is Divine in *tantum* as commanded. For God Commandeth all men to Own him; to believe that *God is*, and *that he is the Rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him*: And God ſo far approveth it: St. *James* ſaith, (*Thou doſt well*) to him that believeth there is a God, much more that is profeſſedly devoted to him.

Let us by this examine the Jewiſh Church: *Jews* now may be 1. A Body, 2. Of Men, 3. Separated from the reſt of the World, even in Religion and Church pretenſions. 4. United to God as Creatures, as Men, as the corporal ſeed of *Abraham*, and as profeſſing Belief, Love and Obedience to God, as their God. 5. Strictly united among themſelves: 6. By a Covenant, 7. Which God once commanded, and ſtill approveth ſo far as they own God.

Let us conſider whether this deſcription take not in, thoſe in every Nation that fear God and work Righteouſneſs, that never heard of Chriſt, (being thus combined.) And whether the Kingdom of God, be not larger than his Church: Joyn the Head and Tail of this mans book together, and by the Head (the deſcription) for ought I ſee, *Jews*, *Mahometans*, if not almoſt all Heathens, are the Church: But at the End, I think none on Earth is the Church: At leaſt none that ſeparate from a pair of Organs, or an ignorant Curate; Nor can any man know who.

Page 2. §. 2. He explaineth his Word [*Body*] as *oppoſed to a confuſed Multitude*.

A. But a *Community* of *Equals*, that have no Governours, may have order, and be no confuſed Multitude. And he himſelf after pleads over much for neceſſity of Rulers.

P. 3. §. 3. And in many places, his Confuſion and grand errour is repeated, that the *Chriſtian Church is but one:* p. 7. *We know no Church but what all Chriſtians are members of by Baptiſme, which is the Univerſal Church:* p. 8. *There is but one Church, of which all Chriſtians are members, as there is but one Covenant;* p. 19. *If there be but one Church and one Communion, of which all true Chriſtians are members,* &c. p. 23. I am no otherwiſe *a member of any particular Church, than I am of the Univerſal:* p. 40. It's a *ſchiſmatical Notion of memberſhip that divides the Chriſtian Church into diſtinct memberſhips, and therefore into the diſtinct Bodyes:* And p. 19. and often he ſaith, *thoſe Churches which are not members of each other, are ſeparate Churches and Schiſmaticks.*

A. I had hoped that no man but Mr. *Cheny* had talkt at this rate.

I. It's agreed on, that there is but one Univerſal Church: The contrary is a Contradiction. 2. It is agreed, that there is no lawful particular Church which is not a part of the Univerſal. 3. That whoever hath juſt Union and Communion with a true particular Church, hath Union and Communion with the Univerſal: 4. That all men in their Worſhip of God, ſhould accordingly perform it (and do all that they do) as Men in that Relation to the Univerſal Church: None of this is controverted.

II. But I had hoped never to have heard any but *Seekers* ſay, that there are *not many lawful* particular Churches, *diſtinct* from the whole and from one another, though not disjunct in the Common Eſſentials. For the proof of the contrary,

1. I begin with that which I expect ſhould be moſt powerful; The mans own after-Confeſſions, to which he is oft brought. *Pag.* 8. *Diſtance of Place and the neceſſities and conveniences of Worſhip and Diſcipline, has divided the Church into ſeveral parts and members, and Particular Churches,* &c. So *pag.* 14. *pag.* 19. *All Chriſtian Churches ought to be members of one.* More fully *p.* 20, 21. This is *ad hominem, Yea and Nay* is his Reſolution.

2. But I'le bring other Arguments that prevail more with me. The Sacred Scriptures oft tell us of *many Churches*, therefore there are many. *Act.* 9. 31. *The Churches had reſt*; and 15. 4. *Confirming the Churches*; 16. 5. *So were the Churches eſtabliſhed in the Faith*; Rom. 16. 4. *All the Churches of the Gentiles:* So ver. 16. 1 Cor. 7. 17. *So ordain I in all Churches*; 11. 16. *Neither the Churches of God* (have ſuch Cuſtom;) 14. 33. *As in all the Churches of the Saints*; 34. *Let your Women keep ſilence in the Churches.* So 16. 1. 19. & 2 Cor. 8. 1. *The Grace of God beſtowed on the Churches of Macedonia:* 18. *Whoſe Praiſe is in the Goſpel through all the Churches.* So 19. 23, 24. and 11. 8. 28. *The care of all the Churches*; 12. 13. *Inferior to the other Churches.* Gal. 1. 2, 22. 1 Theſ. 2. 14. 2 Theſ. 1. 4. Rev. 1. 4. *To the ſeven Churches,* ver. 11, 20. *Angels* and *Candleſticks* of the ſeven Churches. *And* 2. 7, 11, 17, 29. *and* 3. 6, 13, 22, 23. *and* 22. 16. His Concordance might have ſhew'd him all theſe in order, *Phil.* 4. 15. *No Church communicated with me (concerning giving and receiving) but ye only.* The diſpute now muſt be, whether

the Apoſtles or this *Reſolver* be to be believed: They ſay, there are *many Churches*, parts of *One*; he ſaith, *There is but one, and it's Schiſmatical to divide it into diſtinct memberſhips* or *Bodyes*, &c. It's no Schiſme here to ſay, I am for *Paul* and the Holy Scripture: Let who will believe the contradictor.

"3. My next Argument is this: Where there are many Political Societies, "conſiſting of Chriſtian Paſtors and People, profeſſedly aſſociated *for the* "ordinary Exerciſe of thoſe Relations as ſuch, in holy Communion, in Chri- "ſtian Doctrine, Worſhip, Order and Converſation, for Edification in "true Faith, Hope, Love and Obedience, and the Glorifying of God "therein. There are many diſtinct true Churches, parts of the Church "Univerſal; *But on Earth there are many ſuch Societyes*, &c. *Ergo*, &c.

Either the controverſie is *De re* or *de nomine* (for we called *Separatiſts* uſe to ſeparate theſe.) 1. If *de re*; Let the exiſtence of the thing defined be tryed by Scripture, Reaſon and common Experience: 2. If *de nomine*; *Forma quæ dat eſſe dat Nomen:* Here is the true *ſpecifick form* which is found in many ſingle Churches, *ergo* the Name of ſuch *ſingle* (or individual) Churches is due to them.

4. Again *ad hominem*, from the conſequences: 1. If there be not many ſingle Churches in the Univerſal, then there are not many Patriarchal, National, Provincial, Metropolitical, Dioceſan, or Parochial Churches: For *non entium non datur numerus:* Many *nothings* is a contradiction. *Multæ ſunt ergo ſunt; Ab eſt tertij adjecti ad eſt ſecundi valet argumentum.*

But if there be not many, then 1. All the Pariſh Churches in *England* being but one, and not many, a Patron can have right to preſent to no one as a Church, more than to another. 2. Then the Parſon, Vicar or Curate is no more the Parſon of one Church than of another; nor bound to no more Care and Duty; for there is but one. 3. Then no one is bound to go to one Pariſh Church more than another; for there is but one. 4. Then the Temple and Tithes belong no more to one than another. 5. Then no Biſhop is the proper Biſhop of one Dioceſan Church, more than of another. 6. Then all the revenues of the Biſhop of *London*, are no more appropriate to one Church than to another. 7. Then you owe no more Obedience to the Biſhops of one Dioceſan Church than another: 8. Then you make the King no more Head or Governour of the Church of *England*, than of another. 9. Then a Dioceſan oweth no Reverence to a Metropolitane Church (if there be none ſuch.) 10. Then many Churches cannot have Communion nor ſend Biſhops to Councils; (if there be not many.) 11. And the charge of Separation from a Church that is no Church, is a contradiction.

5. I adde, from Parity of Reaſon, if many diſtinct ſubordinate Societies may make one Civil Body Politick, ſo they may one Univerſal Church: But the Antecedent is undoubted. If it be Learnedly ſaid with Mr. *Cheny*, that *one whole cannot be Part of another whole*; One may attain the perfection by that time he hath worn the Breeches but a few years, to know that a whole Fa-

mily

mily may be part of a whole Village, and a whole Vicinage be part of a whole City, and a whole Colledge be part of a whole Univerſity; and a whole City part of a whole Kingdom; and a whole Kingdom part of the whole Earth.

And if it be objected, that the Names of the *whole* and *parts* are here divers; but a *Church* and a *Church* are the ſame Name. I Anſwer, at the ſame age one may learn that the ſame Name proveth not the ſameneſs of the things Named; and that *ex penuria nominum* the *Genus* and *Species*, the *Totum* and *Parts* have oft equivocally the ſame Name, with the Addition of juſt Notes of diſtinction. Sometimes an Academy of many Schools is called *Schola*, and ſo are the ſingle Schools therein: The City of *London* is a *Society*; and ſo are the Societies of Merchant-Taylors, Drapers, Mercers, *&c.* therein.

§. 4. *But theſe Churches muſt be members of one another, or they are Schiſmaticks.*

A. 1. How can that be, if they be all but one. 2. This is alſo above or below the *ferula* age. They are no members of one another, but all members of the whole: Yet how oft have we this with the ſting of Schiſme (as *Damning* as *Murder or Adultery*) in the Tail of it. The hand is not a member or part of the Foot, or the Foot of the Hand, or the Liver a member of the Lungs, *&c.* but each one of the Man: If ever I were a Schoolmaſter again, I would perſwade my Boyes, that A is not a member of B, nor B of C, *&c.* but each of the Alphabet; And that one leaf of their Book is not a member of another, but both of the Book; And if they were ripe for the Univerſity, I would perſwade them that *Exeter* Colledge is not a member of *Corpus Chriſti*, nor that of *Lincoln*, &c. but all of the Univerſitie of *Oxford*. And I think that *Briſtol* is not a member of *Exeter* or *Glouceſter*, &c. but all of *England*; and that the Company of Stationers are not part of the Society of Merchants or Drapers, *&c.* but all of *London*.

What a Priviledg is it, that a Man may believe this about any ſuch thing without Schiſme and Damnation! And how dreadful to fall into ſuch Churchmens hands that in their Caſe make it Schiſme, Separation and Damnation. But there is a Remedy.

§. 5. But he hath reaſon for what he ſaith: *p.* 3,4. [*Indeed it is extreamly abſurd and unreaſonable, to ſay, that the Chriſtian Church, which is built on the ſame Foundation*, &c. who *enjoy all Priviledges* in *Common*, *ſhould be divided into as diſtinct* and *ſeparate Bodies*, *thô of the ſame kind and nature*, as *Peter*, *James* and *John* are *diſtinct Perſons --- It's abſurd to ſay*, That *where every thing is common there is not one Community*.

Anſ. Let us not ſwallow this without Chewing: 1. Whether all be *extreamly abſurd* and *unreaſonable* which ſuch Doctors call ſo; I am grown to doubt as much as whether all be Schiſm which Schiſmaticks call ſo: *Ipſe dixit* is no Proof.

2. What the meaning of this great, Decantate Word [*Separate*] is, muſt

muſt anon be enquired: But, may not Churches be *diſtinct* and not culpably ſeparate? He confeſſeth afterwards both local diſtinction and ſeparation.

3. How far are the *Univerſal Church* and *Particular* Churches diſtinct? As *Whole* and *Parts?* Muſt the World at laſt learn that *Whole* and *Parts* are not diſtinct? If you take it for abſurd to diſtinguiſh a Man from a Body, or from a Liver, Hand or Foot, Diſſenters do not; nor to diſtinguiſh a Colledge from an Univerſity, a Houſe from a Street, a Street from a City, *&c.*

But how are the Particular Churches diſtinguiſhed one from another? Reader, ſo conſtantly do ſuch men fight with themſelves, that it's meet to ask, whether they that thus ſay there are not many diſtinct Churches, do not aſſert a far wider difference between many, than thoſe they diſſent from. We affirm that there are many, and that they differ not *in ſpecie*, but *numero*, as Colledges, Cities do among themſelves; but theſe men, after all this, hold not only a numerical, but a ſpecifick difference, even as Parochial, Dioceſan, Provincial, Patriarchal, National; at leaſt Presbyters and Dioceſans differing *Ordine vel Specie* with them, the Church denominated from them muſt do ſo too.

§ 6. But he confirms it. [Peter, James *and* John, *thô they partake of the ſame common nature, yet each of them have a diſtinct Eſſence and Subſiſtence of their own, and this makes them diſtinct Perſons; but where the very Nature and Eſſence of a Body or Society conſiſts in having all things common, there can be but one Body.*

Anſ. I hope its no culpable Separation to diſtinguiſh things as differing *ſpecie & numero*; and this is the Doctors meaning, if his words are ſignificant: and the common way of expreſſing it would have been, [Peter *and* John *differ numerically but not* in ſpecie; *but two Churches differ neither* ſpecie *nor* numero.]

And 1. Reader, whereas he ſaid before, that the *Church is not divided into diſtinct Bodies*, as *James* and *John*, &c.] did you think till now, that *James* and *John*, and the Doctor, and the ſeveral Biſhops had not been diſtinct parts of the Church in their diſtinct natural bodies?

2. And why may there not be diſtinct Politick Bodies, or Compound in one whole as well as natural? certainly, all things corporeal ſave Attomes are Compounds: A Muſcle, a Hand, a Foot, parts ſimilar and diſſimilar in man are all compounded of leſſer Parts. If many Students may make one Colledge, why may not many Colledges make one Univerſity? It's ſtrange if a Doctor deny this.

3. But let us conſider of his Reaſon, and enquire 1. *Whether the Church have all things Common.* 2. *Whether the very Eſſence of it conſiſt in this.*

I. It is granted that the whole *Eſſence* of the *Genus* and *Species* is found in every individual of that *Species*, Natural or Politick; but did we ever hear, till

till Mr. *Cheny* and this Doctor ſaid it, that Politick Bodies differ not *numero* as well as Natural? The Kingdom of *England* and of *France* are two; the Church of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople* long ſtrove which ſhould be uppermoſt, but who ever ſaid that they were not two?

II. Have they all things common? Diſſenters would have excepted Wives and Husbands, (tho the Canons called Apoſtolical do not;) Why ſhould the Eſſence of a Church lie in this, and not the Eſſence of a City or Kingdom? Tories in *Ireland* would have all common; Merchants and Tradeſmen, Knights, Lords and Princes here would not. But it's no Schiſm here alſo to diſtinguiſh *ſimpliciter* & *ſecundum quid*, Propriety and the uſe of Propriety: There is no *Community* without *Propriety*: Men have firſt a Propriety in themſelves, their members, their food, the acqueſts of their Labours, their Wives and Children, and Goods. And they conſent to Community to preſerve this Propriety, becauſe every man loveth himſelf: And yet they muſt uſe their Propriety, (even of Life) for common good, becauſe all are better than one: But if they had no Propriety they could not ſo uſe it for the Common-wealth.

And I never conformed to the Doctrine that denyeth *Propriety* in Church Members and Particular Churches, and thought all ſimply *common*. I'le tell you what *Particular* Churches have to individuate them, not common to all.

1. They conſiſt of individual natural Perſons, *many* of which as much differ from *many* other Perſons, (thoſe in *England* from thoſe in *Spain*) as *one man* doth from *another*.

2. Their Graces and gifts are numerically diſtinct (Faith, Hope, Love, &c.) from thoſe of other Churches tho *ejuſdem ſpeciei*. 3. *England* and *France*, *London* and *Oxford*, have Churches of different *place* and *Situation*: 4. But the *formal individuating* difference is their neareſt Relation to their ſeveral *Paſtors*; as ſeveral Kingdoms, Cities, Schools are numerically diſtinct by their diſtinct Kings, Maiors, School-maſters, ſo are ſeveral Churches *ejuſdem ſpeciei*. 1. *Theſſ.* 5. 12, 13. *Know thoſe that are among you and over you in the Lord, and eſteem them highly in love for their* Works ſake. As every mans Wife, Children and Servants muſt be uſed for the common good, and yet are not common, one mans Wife and Children are not anothers; So the Biſhop of *London*, of *Oxford* &c. muſt govern his Church for the good of the Univerſal; but he is not the Biſhop of *Glouceſter*, *Norwich*, *Paris*, *Rome*.

Theſe are differences enow to conſtitute a *numerical* difference of Churches: *Paul* diſtinguiſheth the Biſhops of *Philippi*, *Epheſus*, &c. from others.

Do you yet ſee no *Priviledges* that one hath Proper, and not common to all? none that make a difference *in ſpecie*, but both *numerical* and *gradual*. 1. All Churches have not Biſhop *Jewel*, Biſhop *Andrews*, Doctor *Stillingfleet*, Doctor *Sherlock* to be their Teachers: All Churches be not taught all that's in this Reſolver. 2. All Churches have not men of the ſame ſoundneſs,

neſs nor excellency of Parts: It was once taken for lawful to account them *ſpecially worthy of double honour who laboured in the Word and Doctrine*, and to eſteem men for their *works ſake*. *Paul* ſaith of *Timothy*, *I have no man like minded*. If thoſe that heard not a Sermon in many years differed not from your Congregation, why do you preach?

I am reproached in Print for telling the world this notorious truth; That I lived till ten years old, where four men, four years hired ſucceſſively were Readers and School-maſters; two Preached (as it was called) once a Month, the other two never: Two drank themſelves to beggery. After I lived where many Pariſhes about us had no Preachers: The Pariſh that I lived in, had a Church with a Vicar that never preached, and a Chappel with a Parſon eighty years old, that had two Livings twenty Miles diſtant, and never preacht: His Son a Reader and Stage-player was ſometime his Curate: His Grand-ſon, my School-maſter, his Curate next that, never preacht in his life, but drunk himſelf to beggery. One year a Taylor read the Scripture, and the old man (the beſt of them all) ſaid the Commmon-Prayer without book (for want of ſight.) The next year a poor Threſher read the Scripture. After that a Neighbours Son (my Maſter) was Curate, who never preacht but once, and that when he was drunk, (in my hearing) on *Mat.* 25. *Come ye Bleſſed*, and *go ye Curſed*;] the ſaddeſt Sermon that ever I heard. Theſe things were no rarities: Now my aſſertion is, That the Church that had ſuch as *Auſtin*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Jewel*, *Andrews*, and ſuch worthy men as *London* now hath many, had Priviledges diſtinct from theſe, (and many the like) that I was in.

If you ſay that every Biſhop and Preacher is as much the Biſhop and Preacher to all other ſingle Churches, as to that which is his Title; then 1. He muſt be condemned for not *teaching* them all. 2. Then he may claim maintenance from them all. 3. Then he may intrude into any mans Charge. 4. Then no Church is unchurcht for want of a Biſhop, for any one Biſhop is Biſhop to every Church in the World; and ſo *ubi Epiſcopus ibi Eccleſia*, ſignifieth but that Church and Biſhop are on the ſame Earth; and *Eccleſia eſt Plebs Epiſcopo adunata* may be verified if there be but one in the World. 5. And ſo Mr. *Dodwell* and ſuch are ſelf-confuted before you are aware: *Geneva*, *Holland*, and all Presbyterians are true Churches, for they have all Biſhops; *e.g.* The Biſhop of *London* is Biſhop to them all: For if one man be no more a Member of one ſingle Church than of another, and ſo no more a Subject to one Biſhop than to another, then one Biſhop is no more Paſtor of one Church than of another.

7. And how can you magnifie the Church of *England* for a Wiſe, Learned, Pious Clergy above other Churches, if all Priviledges be common, and they have no proper Paſtors of their own.

8. Do you think that the Church, *e. g.* Of *Hippo*, that was in *Auſtins* dayes, was the ſame numerical ſingle Church with that which is there now, (were

(were there any) or with the Dioceſan Church of *London?* if not, then at leaſt diſtance of time, and change of Perſons maketh divers Particular Churches; and it's no more againſt the unity of the Church Univerſal to have divers particular Churches in it in the ſame Age, than in divers Ages.

In ſhort, Diverſity of matter and form maketh a numerical Diverſity (as of Natural, ſo) of Politick Bodies of the ſame *ſpecies*: But the Churches of *Epheſus*, *Smyrna*, *Thyatira*, *Philadelphia*, &c. were of divers matter and form numerically; *Ergo* they were divers Political Churches.

Sure God doth not commend *Laodicea* for *Philadelphia*'s Church Virtues, nor condemn the Church of *Philadelphia* for the other Churches Sins.

And if the Angels be Biſhops, why are ſome Biſhops praiſed as the Biſhops of ſuch Churches, and the Biſhops of other Churches threatned.

But I confeſs this is a ready way to end the Controverſies between the Biſhops of ſeveral Churches which ſhall be greateſt, if they be all but one.

But I hope that when the Biſhop of *Rome* and his Church was corrupted, it is not true that every Biſhop and Church fell with him, (or with any that hath turned to Mahumetaniſm.)

To be no longer on this, (which I thought no Prelatiſt would ever have put me on) if theſe men ſpeak not notoriouſly againſt Scripture, againſt the conſtant Language of Canons and Fathers, Hiſtorians and Lawyers, and all Antiquity, and all Chriſtian Countreys and Divines, (yea, even thoſe that at *Trent* would have had only the Pope to be of immediate Divine Right) then I know not any thing by Reading. And if poor Nonconformiſts muſt be put to defend themſelves againſt ſuch ſingularities, and be Schiſmaticks unleſs they will differ from all the Chriſtian World of all Ages, there is no Remedy.

§. 7. But *p.* 5, 6. he tells us, [that *a Church is made by a Divine Covenant— God only can conſtitute a Church: Such Perſons, if there be any ſo abſurd, are not worth diſputing with, who dare affirm the Church to be an humane Creature*, or *the invention* of *men.*—— *And no Church can depend on humane Contracts; for then a Church would be a humane* Creature and *Conſtitution, whereas a Church can be founded only on a Divine Covenant*——

1. Who would think but this man were a Nonconformiſt, that talks ſo like them (*e. g. Ameſius in Medul. Theol.*) againſt humane Church Forms? But what then will Biſhop *Bilſon*, and almoſt all other Biſhops and Chriſtians be thought of, who affirm Patriarchal and Metropolitical Churches (and many of the Dioceſane) to be but humane Conſtitutions and Inventions. And if theſe be not worth the diſputing with, it ſeems, that you differ from them more than Separatiſts do: and then were not all theſe Schiſmaticks? and then, are not you a Schiſmatick if you communicate with them? yea, your Mr. *Dodwel* himſelf maketh Dioceſan Churches to be a humane Creature; and A. Biſhop *Bromhall* much pleadeth for mans power to make Patriarchal Churches; and ſo do ſuch others.

2. But is it true that humane Contracts make not a Church? *Anſ.* Not alone: But I think that all Churches are made by mutual Contracts, and humane is one part of that which is mutual.

I. As to the *Univerſal Church*, 1. God as Legiſlator and Donor, inſtituteth the *ſpecies* of Covenanting by Baptiſm, and therein he commandeth mans conſent to his *offered Covenant*; and conditionally promiſeth to be our God: But, *Conditionale nihil ponit in eſſe*: This much maketh no Chriſtian, nor Church. To command a man to be a Chriſtian, and conditionally to promiſe him life if he will be one, proveth him not to be one; elſe all were Chriſtians that reject an offered Chriſt.

2. But when man *conſenteth* and covenanteth with God, then Gods conditional gift becomes actual and efficacious, the man being a capable Recipient, and not before: and in this it is the Contract that is the *Fundamentum Relationis*; but a ſingle Promiſe is not a mutual Covenant or Contract.

So that it is no wiſer Divinity to ſay, Gods Covenant and not mans conſent, Covenant or Contract with God, doth make Chriſtians, and the univerſal Church; than it is ſober Reaſon to ſay, That Gods Inſtitution of Marriage or Magiſtracie only doth make the Relation of Husband and Wife, without their covenanting conſent, or doth make Common-wealths, without the conſent or Covenant of Sovereign and Subjects. Did this Doctor think that *Voluntarineſs* is not as neceſſary to the Relation of Chriſtianity as to the Relation of Prince and Subjects; yea, or of Husband and Wife? if he do, he is ſhamefully miſtaken. Baptiſm delivereth men poſſeſſion of *Pardon*, *Grace* and *right* to Glory; and can men have this againſt their wills? One would think by the Doctrine and courſe of ſome men, that they could force men to Pardon and Salvation! if I believed that their force could accompliſh this, I would never call it Perſecution. If they can force men to be true Chriſtians, they may force them to be juſtifyed and ſaved; and then they are very uncharitable if they do not: Let them then ceaſe preaching and diſputing us to their Opinion, but bring us all to Heaven whether we will or not.

Yea the ſelf-contradictor, playing faſt and looſe, confeſſeth *p.* 6. That *no man at age can be admitted to Baptiſm, till he profeſs his faith in Chriſt, and voluntarily undertake the Baptiſmal Vow:* And is not that *humane Covenanting?*

Yea, he knoweth that the Liturgie maketh even Neighbours or Strangers, vow and covenant, both in the name of the Child and for the Child. And ſo neceſſary doth the Epiſcopal Church think *humane Covenanting*, that without this no Child muſt be Baptized publickly though the Parents would covenant, and that they can neither for Love nor Money (for many poor men hire Godfathers) get any one (much leſs three) who examined, will ſeriouſly purpoſe to perform the Covenant for the Childs holy Education which they make.

II. But

II. But is not *humane Covenanting* a cauſe of *ſingle Church* Relation as well as of *univerſal?* I ſee no cauſe to doubt it; and I am ſure that the Church for a thouſand years (before and ſince Popery came in) have declared him no Biſhop that comes in without *conſent* of Clergie and People; which *Conſent* is their covenanting act.

To make a ſingle Church, manifold conſent goeth to the *Fundamentum Relationis.* 1. God commandeth ſingle Church Officers, order and conſent, and promiſeth them his bleſſing where they are met: The Lord and his Angels are among them: No command is vain, and without a virtual Promiſe. 2. To this a threefold humane conſent is needful, Ordinarily: 1. the Perſons called. 2. The Ordainers (when it may be had.) 3. The Peoples. He that formerly, from the Apoſtles dayes, for a thouſand years, ſhould have ſaid, that neither the covenanting, that is the *conſent* of the Paſtor, or People, or Ordainers, is neceſſary to the *Fundamentum* of a ſingle Church Relation or Form, would have been taken for a wild-brain'd Schiſmatick at leaſt.

§. 8. But ſaith this Doctor (and another of them) Ep. 6. *But the Independent Church Covenant between Paſtor and people, is of a very different nature from this: Unleſs any man will ſay, that the voluntary Contract and Covenant which the Independents exact from their Members, and wherein they place a Church ſtate, be part of the Baptiſmal vow; if it be not, then they found the Church upon a humane Covenant; for Chriſt hath made but one Covenant with Mankind which is contained in the Vow of Baptiſm; if it be, then no man is a Chriſtian but an Independent.*

Anſ. Alas for the Church that is taught at this rate!

1. I never ſaw what Independents do in this caſe; but I think none of them that are Sober own any other ſort of Church but the *univerſal*, and *ſingle Churches* as members of it, and therefore require no Contract but 1. To the Covenant of Baptiſm or Chriſtianity. 2. To the Duties of their particular Church-relation.

2. And nothing is here of neceſſity but *manifeſted Conſent* (which is a real Contract) but a clearer or a darker, an explicite or implicite conſent differ only *ad melius eſſe.*

3. Is not God the Author of Magiſtracy, Marriage, &c. And is it any violation of Gods part, if Rulers and People, Husband and Wife be Covenanters by his command?

4. Is it any renuntiation of Baptiſm to promiſe at Ordination to obey the Arch-Biſhop and Biſhop, and to take the Oath of Canonical Obedience? Is it not ſtill exacted? Are not the Takers of it obliged? are not Covenants impoſed on all that will be Miniſters in the act of Uniformity? are not multitudes kept out and caſt out for not making theſe Covenants? *Quo teneam nodo*, &c. How ſhould one deal with ſuch ſlippery men? Good Mr. *Zachary Cawdry* that wrote to have all men to covenant Submiſſion to Biſhops

and Pariſh Miniſters, did not dream that it was any violation of Baptiſm.

5. Do not men owe duty to their Paſtors which they owe to no others? If not, put them not on it: Why are you angry with them for going from you? Why doth the Canon ſuſpend thoſe that receive them to Communion from another Pariſh that hath no Preacher? Why are we ruined for not covenanting as aforeſaid? if yea, then is it againſt Baptiſm to promiſe to do our duty?

6. But hath God commanded or inſtituted no Covenant but Baptiſm? Yes ſure, the Matrimonial at leaſt; and I think Ordination is covenanting for the Miniſtry: Did not the Apoſtle *Acts* 14. 23. ordain Elders in every Church? if you would have [by *Suffrage*] left out of the Tranſlation, no ſober man can doubt but it was by the Peoples conſent; and was it without their conſent that *Titus* was to ordain Elders in every City? Could any then come otherwiſe in? Did not all Churches hold and practiſe this after, and was it none of Gods Inſtitution? If ſo, God requireth us not to take any of you for our Biſhops or Paſtors: Who then requireth it? What meaneth *Paul* when he ſaith, *they gave up themſelves to the Lord and to us, by the Will of God.*

7. Can the wit of man imagine how it is poſſible without conſent, for a man to be made the Paſtor of any Flock? Who ever ordained a man againſt his will? or for any man to have Title againſt his will, to the proper overſight and paſtoral care of any one Paſtor, or the priviledges of any Church? If any think they may be cramm'd and drencht with the Sacrament, or that an unwilling man may have a ſealed pardon and gift of Salvation delivered him, he will make a new Goſpel. And how any particular Paſtor is bound to give that man the Sacrament ordinarily, that conſents not ordinarily to receive it of him, I know not. No man is a member of any City, or any Company of Free-men in the City, but by mutual conſent; and the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy to the King maketh not the Oath of a Citizen as ſuch or of a Member of a Company as ſuch, unlawful.

8. Doth this Doctor think that he ever yet proved to ſober men, that the Covenant aforeſaid, of Godfathers and Godmothers, to make Chriſtians, and members of the univerſal Church, is more (or ſo much) of Gods Inſtitution, than the Contract or Conſent between Biſhops or Paſtors and People to make a ſingle Political Church?

9. If it follow not, that no man is the Kings Subject that ſweareth not to the City; It will not follow, that none is a Chriſtian, but an Independent, or Church-conſenter.

10. How are your Pariſh or Dioceſan Church members known to your ſelves or any others? Are all that dwell in the Pariſh or Dioceſs your Church members? Then Atheiſts, Sadducees, Hobbiſts, and all vicious men and thouſands that never communicate are ſuch: Yea thoſe that you call Separatiſts.

If it be every tranſient Communicant, have you a proper Paſtoral care of every Travellers Soul that ſo communicates with you? You after plead that his very ordinary Communion maketh him not a member, if he be unwilling to be one. And is not his conſent then neceſſary? Or if ordinary Communion be the teſt (how few then of great Pariſhes are of the Church) yet that is becauſe ſuch Communion ſigniſieth their Conſent to your over-ſight of them.

§. 9. But it's much to be approved which *p.* 5. and oft he ſaith, that *to be taken into Covenant with God, and to be received into the Church is the very ſame thing*, as to the Univerſal Church. By which all his groſs Schiſmatical Accuſations afterwards are confuted. No man then is out of the Church that is not out of the Baptiſmal Covenant, either by not *taking* it, or by renouncing ſome *Eſſential part* of it? And when will he prove, that to take him; rather than Dr. *Bates* that was caſt out, to be a Teacher or Paſtor at *Dunſtans*, or to take this man and not another to be the Lawful Biſhop or Prieſt, and to obey him in every Oath and Ceremony, is an Eſſential part of the Baptiſmal Covenant, or of Chriſtianity? But ſuch a rope of Sand, as Mr. *Dodwell* and this man tye together, to bind men to their Sect, will ſerve turn with ſome that know not who ſpeaks Truth, by any ſurer way than prejudice.

§. 10. His Doctrine of *Separation* and *gathering Churches out of Churches* is anon to be conſidered: But whereas he addes, *p.* 7. [*Theſe men convert Chriſtians from common Chriſtianity, and the Communion of the Univerſal Church to Independency.*]

Anſ. My acquaintance with them is ſmall, ſave by reading their Books: And there are few Men of any Common Denomination (Epiſcopal, or other) that are not in many things diſagreed. But I muſt in Charity to them ſay, that as far as I can judge by their Writings or Speech, he palpably ſlandereth them; and that none that are grave and ſobr among them do ſeparate their Churches from the common Chriſtianity or the Univerſal Church, any more than the Company of Stationers, Ironmongers, &c. are ſeparated from the City of *London*, or *London* from *England*, or Trinity Colledge from the Univerſity of *Cambridge* or *Oxford*. I never met with man, and I am confident never ſhall do, that doth not take his Independent Church to be part of the Univerſal, and Dependent as a part on the whole. If belying others ſtopt at words, the wrong were ſmall: But when it's made but the ſtairs to hatred and deſtroying, it's his way to cure Schiſm that is commonly painted with Horns and Cloven feet. If a man come from a Countrey Village and be made by Covenant a Citizen of *London*, how prove you that he renounceth King or Kingdom?

But he ſaith, *p.* 9. *Thoſe who wilfully ſeparate from the Corporation to which the Charter was granted, forfeit their Intereſt in the Charter.*

Anſ. What Reader doth this man preſume upon that will not ask him, how he proveth 1. That Gods Law or Charter to his Church doth not re-

quire

quire them to congregate in distinct single Churches (as *London* Charter doth to erect several Companies, and the Universities several Colledges?) 2. And that God hath not in his Word given order or command for such single Churches: But that the Apostles and *Titus* by fixing Elders to their several Churches and Cities, separated from the Universal Church? 3. And that their subordinate Churches have not need of distinct subordinate consent and duty: And that our Diocesan Churches all separate from the Universal? Did he think these things need no proof at all?

It may be he will say that the *Diocesan depend on the Universal, but the Presbyterian or Independent do not.*

I Answer, Dependance is either that of *Subjects* on Soveraign or Magistrates for *Government*, or that of a *Community* of *Equals* for *Communion.* In the former respect they depend on none but Christ as Universal Soveraign, Nor on any Foriegners for Governments: In the latter, they depend on all true Churches for Communion: And Doctor *Hammond* and most Diocesans hitherto have said that Diocesan Churches are thus far Independent or National at most.

And if any be for a *Forreign Jurisdiction*, in Charity before they perswade *England* to it, they should procure them a Dispensation from all the Oaths, that have sworn all this Kingdom against *endeavouring any change of Government*, and against a *Foreign Jurisdiction:* For some Fanaticks now Dream that *PER* is the Mark of the Beast, and that χξς (which is the number of his Name, is nominal as well as numeral, and refers to [*CH*-urch χ (and) STate] (For as for them that find a *mans* name in them, I abhorr their Exposition more.)

§. 11. *P.* 9. [*God* (*saith he*) *hath not made any Covenant in particular with the Church of* Geneva, France *or* England, *&c.*

A. 1. God hath made one General Law, for Christians congregating with their fixed Elders or Bishops in particular Churches all the World over: And his Command is not without Promise of *being with them* to the End of the World; and that Promise becometh a Promise to every Church so congregate. God hath not made distinct Laws or Promises to every Christian: But the Promise to Justifie all Believers justifieth each single Person when he believeth. If the King should make one common Law to command all his Subjects that are Freeholders to live in Corporations or Hundreds, described with their priviledges, those priviledges would be all theirs that are so incorporated: As one Charter may Priviledge every *London* Company, diversified by subordinate Agreements.

2. And that God who will have them thus incorporated and distributed into several single Churches, doth Covenant (or *Promise*) according to their demerits to each. Do I need to recite the peculiar Promises and threats to the seven *Asian* Churches, *Rev.* 2. and 3. which are Covenants to them?

§. 12. Next *Pag.* 10. He will tell us what *Communion* is, and in many

not at 10-

words, it is to tell us that *Communion* is *nothing but Union*: I know that *quoad notationem nominis*, *Communion* may ſignifie, *Union with others*: But they that write Politicks have hitherto diſtinguiſhed *Union* and *Communion*, taking *Communion* for Actual *Communication*, or exerciſe of the duties of men in Union? But to ſpeak croſs to other Writers on the ſame Subjects and give no reaſon for it, and to confound *Union* and *Communion*, is one part of this edifying Reſolution.

§. 13. *Pag.* 11. [*Our Communion with the Church conſiſts in being members of the Church, which we are made by Baptiſm,*] (ſaith he.)

Then the Baptized are ſtill in Communion with the Church, till their baptiſm be nullified: And hath he proved us Apoſtates?

§. 14. *Pag.* 12. *Should any man who is no member of the Church, nor owns himſelf to be ſo, intrude into the Church and Communicate in all Holy Offices, it's no Act of Communion*, &c.

A. I thought communicating ordinarily in Holy Offices, had gone for an owning of Communion: If it do not, would you would tell us how to know who are of your Church.

§. 15. *P.* 13. Saith he (*Church-Communion does not conſiſt in particular Acts of Communion, which can be performed among thoſe who are preſent and Neighbours, but in membership: Now as a member is a member of the whole Body* (*not meerly of any part of it*, &c.) *All the Subjects of* England *who never ſaw nor converſt with each other, are members of the ſame Kingdom.*]

A. 1. That word [*meerly*] hath more Craft than Juſtice or Honeſty: *Meerly* ſignifieth *Only* I ſuppoſe; and if he would make his Reader think that they that are for *ſingle Church peculiar membership* and conſent, do take themſelves to be [*meerly* or *only*] members of thoſe ſingle Churches, and not of the Univerſal, it is ſhameleſs injury.

2. Will he ever draw men to conformity by making them believe, that becauſe they owe Common Communion to all Chriſtians, therefore we owe no ſpecial duty to the Biſhops, Prieſts, Churches or Neighbours where we are ſetled? Do the Men of one Colledge, School, Corporation, owe no more duty to that than to all others? Do the Free-holders of *Bedford-ſhire* chooſe Knights for *Middleſex*; or the Citizens of *Oxford* chooſe Officers in *London?* Theſe ſeem ſtrange Reſolutions to us.

3. But doth he remember that [*if Communion conſiſt not in Acts of Communion* to ſuch, *but in membership even with the diſtant,*] then he that is baptized, and no Apoſtate, and performeth no other Acts of Communion to the Biſhops, Parſon or People where he liveth, than he is bound to perform to them a hundred or thouſand miles off, is no Separatiſt. Methinks this favours Separation too much.

§. 16. *Pag.* 14. When he *denyed any Divine Covenant to make us members of particular Churches diſtinguiſh't from the Univerſal* (as all National, Dioceſan and Parochial are, as parts from the whole) he preſently confuteth all again, ſaying [*The exerciſe of Church Communion as to moſt of the particular*

cular duties and Offices of it muſt be confined to a particular Church and Congregation (for we cannot actually joyn in the Communion of Prayers and Sacraments, &c. but with ſome particular Church.]

A. *Oportuit fuiſſe memorem*, — 1. Reader, doth not this man here confeſs that there are particular Churches? 2. If theſe be not diſtinct from the whole, then each particular is the whole. 3. If the *Exerciſe* muſt be in particular Churches, muſt not men *Conſent* to their Relations and Duties? Is it a ſin to Promiſe Duty? 4. Sure it is not meer *Place*, but a mutual Relation of Paſtors and People that diſtinguiſheth theſe Churches. The Preſbyterians preach't once in the ſame Places that you do, and yet you take them not for the ſame Church Paſtors. If one from *York* or *Cornwall* come into your Pulpit without conſent, do People ſtand as much related to him as to you? Some men are of extraordinary ſufficiency to reſiſt and conquer the cleareſt evidence of Truth.

But he addes [*every Act of Communion thô performed to ſome particular Church, is and muſt be an Act of Communion with the whole Catholick Church.*]

A. And who denyeth this? No ſober Independent or Presbyterian that ever I met with. It's a weighty Truth.

§. 17. *P.* 14. Saith he [*Praying, and Hearing and Receiving the Lords Supper together doth not make us more in Communion with the Church of* England *than with any other true and Orthodox part of the Church, thô in the remoteſt part of the World.*]

A. I think that's not true: With the remoteſt parts you have only Catholick Communion with the Church Univerſal: In *England* and *London* you have that and more; even ſpecial ſubordinate Communion with your own King, Biſhop and Flock.

2. And hath not the Church of *England* ſuch Communion in obedience to its own Laws; (as the Act of Uniformity,) Convocation and Canons, which you have not with all abroad? Do your Biſhops in Convocation make Canon Laws for all the World? Do you Swear Canonical obedience as much to the Biſhop of *Paris*, or *Haffnia*, &c. as to your Ordinary? Do the Canons of all Churches impoſe our Liturgy, or *ipſo facto* excommunicate all that affirm any thing in it, or our Ceremonies or Church Government, to be againſt Gods word? Sure this is a peculiar kind of Communion.

3. If not, why are all the Nonconformiſts caſt out that offer to officiate and Communicate on ſuch terms as are common to all ſound Churches?

Pag. 15. Saith he [*There is nothing in all theſe Acts of Communion which does more peculiarly unite us to ſuch a particular Church than to the whole Chriſtian Church.*]

A. What, neither in theſe *Acts* nor any other! Then we are no more bound to hear you, or maintain you as our Paſtor, than to hear and maintain the whole Chriſtian Church.

§. 18. *P.* 20. Saith he [*There is no other Rule of Catholick Communion for private*

private Christians, but to communicatee in all Religious Offices and all Acts of Government and Discipline with Christians those with whom they live.

A. 1. Elsewhere you added [*sound* and *Orthodox*:] Else they that live with Arians, Socinians, Papists (in *Spain*, *France*, *Italy*, &c.) are bound to communicate with them in all Religious Offices and obey them. 2. This concludeth, that where Presbytery or Independency is the way of the place where we live, all must thus communicate and obey. The King and Custom then may make any way to become our Duty. 3. If you tell us that *it's only with* the *Sound* and *Orthodox*, you were as good say nothing, unless you tell us who must judge that, whether the People themselves, or who for them. 4. But if this be the *only rule* for private Christians, what shall they do, *e. g.* in *Æthiopa*, *Egypt*, *Syria*, and many other Countreys where the Churches are such as General Councils and other Churches judge Hereticks or Schismaticks? And what shall they do, when at *Antioch*, *Alexandria*, *Constantinople*, &c. one party is uppermost (by the Judgment of Councils and Prince) one Year, and another contrary party the next. And what shall they do where the Prince equally tolerateth both, and it's hard to know which is the more numerous? as in *Zeno*'s and *Anastasius* Reign, &c. And what shall they do when many Churches in one City are of divers Tongues, as well as Customs? Have the *Greeks*, *French* and *Dutch* in *London* no rule of Catholick Communion but communicating in all Offices with the English, and obeying all your Bishops Courts?

§. 19. *P.* 21. Saith he [*Distinct and particular Churches which are in Communion with each other, must have their distinct bounds and limits, as every member has it's natural and proper place, and Situation in the Body.*]

A. Why may not the *Greeks*, *Dutch* and *French* live in Communion with the Churches *London* though they live dispersedly among them! In *Brandenburg*, *Hassia*, and many free Cities, and *Belgia*, where Lutherans and Calvinists (as called) live together, and own each other as Brethren, why may not both be Churches of Christ?

§. 20. *P.* 21, 22. A great deal more he hath of the like, making Schismaticks at his Pleasure. [*This is plain in the Case of the Presbyterian and Independent Churches and those other Conventicles* — They *are Churches in a Church*, — *Nothing can justifie the Distinction of Christians into several Churches, but only such a distance of place as makes it necessary*, &c. p. 22. *Distinct Churches in the same place can never be under the same Communion.*

A. These things are repeated so oft, and the word [*separate*] so deceitfully rolled over and over, that I will answer all together under his third Case at the End.

§. 21. *P.* 27. See how openly he recanteth most aforesaid: "*There is a* "*fence indeed wherein we may be said to be members of one particular Church con-*"*sidered as distinct from all other particular Churches:* But that *principally con-*"*sists in Government and Discipline. Every Christian is a member of the Whole*

"*Chriſtian Church, and in Communion with it, but he is under the immediate in-*
"*ſtruction and Government of his own Biſhop and Preſbyters, and is bound to perſo-*
"*nal Communion with them; and this conſtitutes a particular Church, in which all*
"*Acts of Worſhip and all Acts of Diſcipline and Government are under the Direcți-*
"*on and conduct of a particular Biſhop.*]

A. Omitting that he ſeemeth to make the Parochial Churches no Churches, but parts of one, here he ſaith all that he ſeemed to write againſt, and that thoſe that he reproacheth hold, allowing the difference of the *extent* of *Churches.* And is it Edifying to read ſuch a diſcourſe, that ſaith and unſaith by ſelf-contradiction? And he adjoyns 28. p. how by agreement Patriarchal and National Churches are made! And is not Agreement a humane Contract?

CHAP. II.

Of his firſt Caſe.

§. 1. *Page* 31. His firſt Caſe, "*Whether Communion with ſome Church or*
"*other be a neceſſary Duty incumbent on Chriſtians:*] And he thinks
"the Reſolution *of this is as plain, as whether it be neceſſary for every man to be a*
"*Chriſtian: For every Chriſtian is baptized into the Communion of the Church.*

A. In this I know no Chriſtian adverſary to him: But it being the *Univerſal Church* that he giveth his proof of neceſſary Communion with, it's odde to ſay, *We muſt have Communion with ſome Church or other*: As if there were more than one Univerſal Church. 2. But we grant more, that all that can well, ſhould be alſo members of ſome ſingle Church.

§. 2. *P.* 32. He ſaith ["*External and Actual Communion is an Eſſential du-*
"*ty of a Church-member* (meaning a *Chriſtian.*)]

A. 1. And yet before he denyed that Communion lay eſſentially in this Exerciſe, but only in *Union:* Yea and Nay is his Cuſtom. 2. Some few Chriſtians (as thoſe that live where ſuch Communion cannot be had without ſin, *&c.*) are not bound to it; therefore it is not true that it is *Eſſential* to Univerſal Church-memberſhip. And I think ſickneſs endeth not the eſſentials, that diſableth men.

3. Note Reader, that by this mans Doctrine we are all unchriſtened and damned if we do not gather into diſallowed Churches, if we be unjuſtly caſt out of the allowed ones: For all muſt be Church members that will be Chriſtians, and an unjuſt Excommunication cannot diſoblige us from Chriſtianity, nor bind us to conſent to be damned. Now read the 5th 6th 7th 8th, *&c.* Canons of the Church of *England*, which *ipſo facto* Excommunicate all that affirm any thing in their Liturgy, Articles, Ceremonies or Government

ment ſinful, and anſwer *Spalatenſis* arguments againſt Excommunicating *ipſo facto*, and prove all this juſt, and you may prove what you will juſt. But you ſee where he layeth the Controverſie: If any be Excommunicated without ſufficient cauſe, or by Lay Civilians to whom God never gave that power, or by ſuch Biſhops or Paſtors as have no juſt Authority for want of a true call or Conſent; or if any unlawful thing be made neceſſary to Communion, all ſuch perſons muſt by his own confeſſions hold Church-communion whether theſe impoſers will or not; for all Chriſtians are bound to be of ſome Church.

§. 3. *p.* 33, 34. He ſaith that [*None but publick Prayers are the Prayers of the Church properly, and acts of Communion*, that is, ſuch as are *offered by the hands of men authorized and ſet apart for that purpoſe*, &c.]

Anſ. Who would have thought that we are more for the Liturgy than he? I undertake to prove, that all the Reſponſal Prayers, and all the Litany Prayers, in which the Miniſter names but the matter to them, and the People make it a Prayer by ſpeaking the petitioning parts, are all the publick Prayers of the Church, and ſo are all the petitioning Pſalms ſpoke or ſung by the People, and not only that which is offered by the Prieſt: I do not think that he believeth what he careleſly ſaith here, himſelf.

But the Independents are ſtiffer for his firſt *Theſis* (of the neceſſity of Church-communion) than he is, his unfit words I paſs by.

CHAP. III.

Of his ſecond Caſe.

§. 1. THE next queſtion of *Occaſional Communion* as diſtinct from fixed, he turns out of doors, as if there could be no ſuch thing, and it's very true as to the Church univerſal; but as to viſible, actual Communion with this or that particular Church, it is not true.

1. A Traveller of another Country, who on his journey communicateth with every Church where he paſſeth, is not a fixed Member of that Church: for, 1. The Paſtor or Biſhop hath not that peculiar Charge of him as of fixed members. 2. He is not bound where he paſſeth to take ſuch notice of the lives of Communicants or Paſtors, and to admoniſh the Offenders, and tell the Church, as fixed members are. 3. He hath not the right in chooſeing Paſtors or Deacons as the fixed Members have. 4. An itinerant Biſhop *in tranſitu* is not their fixed Biſhop; *ergo* an Iterant Lay-man is not a fixed Member.

The ſame I may ſay of one that is a fixed member of another Church in the ſame City, and cometh to that only to ſignifie univerſal Communion, or

neighbourly ; which, though he deny to be lawful, I ſhall further prove anon.

And the ſame I may ſay of thoſe that dwell where there is no fixed ſingle Church at all, for want of a Paſtor, but they congregate only when ſome ſtrange Miniſter paſſeth through the Town.

CHAP. IV.

His third Caſe.

§. 1. PAge 48, 49. He reſolveth his third Caſe: [*Whether it be lawful to Communicate with two diſtinct and ſeparate Churches*] negatively, and ſaith, [*It is contrary* to all the *Principles of Church Communion, as any thing can poſſibly be; it is to be contrary to our ſelves, it is Communicating with Schiſm: That the Presbyterian and Independent Churches have made an actual ſeparation from the Church of* England *he hath evidently proved*; – and *they are Schiſmaticks, and to communicate with them is to partake in their Schiſm; and if Schiſm be a great ſin, and that which will damn us as ſoon as Adultery and Murther, then it muſt needs be a dangerous thing to communicate with Schiſmaticks.* And p. 42. *There cannot be two diſtinct Churches in one place, one for occaſional, and another for conſtant Communion, without Schiſm.*]

Anſ. To ſave thoſe that are willing from the Poyſon of theſe Schiſmatical Doctrines, lapt up in confuſion by men that abhor diſtinction, or underſtand not what they ſay; I will firſt lay down that truth that he fights againſt, with convincing evidence, and then ſhew you the miſchief of his falſe Doctrine and Application.

§. 2. The confuſion of theſe words [*Church, Communion, Separation* and *Schiſm*] which every one ſignifie divers things, is the chief means to blind and deceive his Reader; whether it do ſo by himſelf I know not.

I. The Word *Church* ſignifieth ſometime the univerſal Church; ſometime a ſingle Organized Church as part of it, and ſometime humane combinations of ſuch ſingle Churches; and that into Dioceſan, Claſſical, Provincial, Patriarchal, National, and Papal.

II. The Specification and Nomination of Churches is from the formal cauſe, and the proper Government is that form: And the Individuation is from matter and form, but principally from the form.

III. The Union of Paſtor and Flock in Relation makes that which is a form aptitudinal (as the Soul to the Body) to be the form in act (as the Union of Soul and Body) and Gods command and conſent with the conſent of the neceſſary relate and correlate cauſe that union.

IV. Union is in order to Communion, which is primary by the exerciſe of

of the formal powers on the matter, and ſecondary by the action of all the parts according to their ſeveral capacities and Offices.

V. The Union of the Church is of divers degrees. 1. The formal Union of the Head and Body, which maketh it eſſentially the [*Chriſtian Church.*] 2. The *Union of the parts among themſelves as Chriſtian*, which maketh them a *Body* capable of Union with the Head. 3. The Union of the parts as unequal Organized, the Official with the reſt, which maketh it an *Organized Body*, fit for its ſpecial uſe and welfare. 4. Union in *integrity* of parts, which maketh it an intire Body. 5. Union in due temperament and Qualities, which maketh it a *healthful* Body. 6. Unity in *Common Accidents*, which make it a *Comely Beautiful* Body joined with the reſt. But, 7. Union in mutable Accidents is unneceſſary and impoſſible.

VI. Theſe ſeveral degrees of Union are found in Bodies natural and Politick. 1. The Union of Soul and Body makes a man, and an Embryo before it be organized. 2. The Union of the Body maketh it capable of the Souls further Operation. 3. The Union of the Organical, chief parts, (as Heart, Lungs, *&c.*) to the reſt make it a true humane Body compleated to the nutriment and action of Life. 4. That it have Hands and Fingers, Feet and Toes, and all integral parts, makes it an intire Body. 5. The due ſite, temperament and qualities of each part make it a ſound Body. 6. Comely colour, hair, action, going, ſpeech, *&c.* make it a *comely Body*. 7. To have all parts of equal quantity and office, would make it uncomely: And to have the ſame hair, colour, *&c.* is unneceſſary at all.

1. The Union of King and Subjects as ſuch makes a Kingdom. 2. That the People be agreed; for one conjunct intereſt and Government maketh them a *Community* capable of Politie or Government. 3. That there be Judges, Maiors and Juſtices, and ſubordinate Cities or Societies, maketh it an Organized Body, in which Kingly Government may be exerciſed to its end, the common good. 4. That no profitable part be wanting, (Judge, Juſtice, Sheriff, *&c.*) maketh it an *entire* Kingdom. 5. That all know their place, and be duly qualified with Wiſdom, Love, Juſtice, Conſcience, Obedience to God firſt, to the Sovereign Power next, to Officers next, *&c.* maketh it a ſound and ſafe Kingdom. 6. That it be well ſituate, fertile, rich, eminent in Learning, Skill, *&c.* maketh it an adorned beautiful Kingdom. 7. That all be equal in Power and wealth is deſtructive; and that all be of one Age, complexion, calling, temper, degree of knowledge, *&c.* is impoſſible: And that all have the ſame language, cloathing, utenſils, *&c.* is needleſs at leaſt.

VII. Jeſus Chriſt is the only Univerſal Soveraign of the Church, both of vital influence and Government; nor hath he ſet up any under him, either Monarchical, Ariſtocratical, Democratical, or mixt, Pope, Council, or diffuſed Clergy, that hath the Power of Legiſlation and Judgment as governing the whole Church; but only Officers that *per partes* govern it, among

mong them, each in his Province, as Juſtices do the Kingdom, and Kings and States the World; nor is any capable of more.

VIII. To ſet up any *univerſal Legiſlators* and Judge, (Pope or Council) is to ſet up an Uſurper of Chriſts Prerogative, called by many a Vice-Chriſt or an Antichriſt; and as bad as making one man or Senate the Soveraign of all the Earth; and to attempt the ſetting up of ſuch or any *forreign Juriſdiction* in this Land, is to endeavour to perjure the whole Kingdom that is ſworn againſt it in the Oath of Supremacy, and ſworn never to endeavour any alteration of Government in Church or State in the Corporation Oath, the Veſtry Oath, the *Militia* Oath, the *Oxford* Oath, with the Uniformity Covenants: And if any ſhould endeavour to introduce ſuch a forreign Juriſdiction who themſelves have had a hand in driving all the Kingdom to all theſe Oaths againſt it, I doubt whether all the Powers of Hell can deviſe a much greater crime againſt Clergy, Cities, and all the Land. Good reaſon therefore had Doctor *Iſaac Barrow* to write againſt it as he hath done, and to confute Mr. *Thorndike*, and all ſuch as of late go that pernicious way, by the pretence of Church Union and Communion. As if one univerſal Soveraign and Legiſlator and Judge, were not enough to unite Chriſts Kingdom, or man could mend his univerſal Laws, and could not ſtay for his final judgment; and Churches and Kingdomes might not till then be ruled without one humane univerſal Soveraign by neceſſary and voluntary agreement among themſelves.

XI. To be a true Believer or Chriſtian, (or the Infant ſeed of ſuch) devoted to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, according to the ſenſe of the Baptiſmal Covenant, uniteth each Member firſt to Chriſt himſelf directly, and conſequently to his Body or Church; and this *coram Deo*, as ſoon as it is done by heart conſent; and *coram Eccleſia*, regularly, as ſoon as he is inveſted by Baptiſm; which Baptiſm, when it may be had ſo, is regularly to be adminiſtred by none but an authorized Miniſter or Deacon; but if through neceſſity or miſtake it be done by a Lay-man, the Ancient Chriſtians took it not for a nullity, much leſs if the Baptizer was taken for a Miniſter by miſtake, being in his place; and if no Baptiſm can be had, open covenanting is vallid.

X. The Papiſts (and their truckling Agents here) have here hampered themſelves in a fatal contradiction: To make themſelves maſters of the World, they would perſwade us, that Sacraments only regenerate and ſanctifie, and that God ſaveth none (by any known way and grant) but by his Covenant Sealed by the Sacraments; and that he authorizeth none to adminiſter this Covenant but Prelates and their Prieſts, and none can validly have it from other hands: And ſo if you will but abate them the proof of many things that ſtand in the way, Heaven and Hell, Salvation and Damnation are at the will and mercy of ſuch Prelates and Prieſts. But unhappily they cannot retrieve their old Opinion, but maintain that Laymen

men and Women may baptize in neceſſity validly, and that Baptiſm puts one into a State of Salvation.

XI. As he that ſwears and keeps his Allegiance to the King is a Subject and Member of the Kingdom, though he be no Member of any Corporation; ſo, though he diſown a thouſand fellow Subjects; yea, though he deny the Authority of Conſtable, Juſtice, Judge; ſo he that is devoted to Chriſt truly in the Baptiſmal Covenant, is a Chriſtian, and a Member of the Univerſal Church, though he were of no particular Church, or did diſown a thouſand Members, or any particular Officer of the Church.

XII. All faults or crimes are not Treaſon: A man that breaketh any Law, is in that meaſure Culpable or puniſhable: but every breach of Law, or wrong to fellow Subjects or Juſtices, as it is not Treaſon, ſo it doth not prove a man no Subject; though ſome may be ſo great as to deſerve death and make him intolerable: And ſo it is in the caſe of our Subjection in the Church to Chriſt.

XIII. To own Chriſts Inſtituted *ſpecies* of Church Officers is needful to the juſt Order, Safety and Edification of the Church (as to own the Courts of Judicature, Juſtices, *&c.* in the Kingdom) but to own this or that *numerical Officer* as truly commiſſioned, is needful only to the right adminiſtration of his own Province.

XIV. As Chriſt did his own work of *univerſal Legiſlation* by himſelf and his *Spirit* eminently in the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, who have recorded all in Scripture, ſo he ſettled Churches to continue to the end aſſociated for Perſonal Communion in his holy *Doctrine*, *Worſhip*, *Order* and *Converſation* with authorized Miniſters, ſubordinate to his adminiſtration in his *Prophetical*, *Prieſtly*, *Kingly* and *Friendly* Relations. And thô theſe may not always or often meet in the ſame place, their neighbourhood maketh them capable of *Perſonal* preſential Communion, as men that may know and admoniſh each other and meet by turns, and in preſence manage their concerns; which differenceth ſingle Churches of the loweſt order from aſſociated Churches of men, that have Communion only by others at diſtance.

XV. As Logicians ſay of other Relations, the *matter* muſt be capable of the *end*, or it is not capable of the name and form; ſo is it here: *e.g.* It is no *Ship* that is made of meer Sponge or Paper, or that is no bigger than a Spoon; it is no Spoon that is as big as a Ship: One Houſe is not a Village, nor one Village a City, nor a City a meer Houſe. So twenty or an hundred or a thouſand Pariſhes aſſociate, cannot be a *ſingle Church* of the *firſt or loweſt Order*, being not capable of *mutual Knowledge*, *Converſe* or *perſonal preſent Communion:* Nor are two or three Lay-men capable to be ſuch a Church, for want of due matter. But ſuppoſing them capable, thô a *full* and *rich* Church have advantage for *Honour* and *Strength*, yet a *ſmall* and *poor* one is *ejuſdem ordinis* as truely a Church; and ſo is their Paſtor, as *Hierom* ſaith of *Rome* and *Eugubium*; ſo *Alexandria* and *Majuma*, &c. *Gregory Neocæſar* was

equally

equally Biſhop of nineteen at firſt, as after of all ſave nineteen in the City.

XVI. If the Apoſtles have Succeſſours in their care and Superiority over many Churches, it will prove that there ſhould yet be men of eminent worth to take care of many Churches, and to inſtruct and admoniſh the younger Miniſters: But it will neither prove 1. That they ſucceed the Apoſtles in the extraordinary parts of their Office. 2. Nor that they have any forcing power by the Sword. 3. Nor that one *Church* hath power over others by Divine right; for the Apoſtles fixed not their power to any particular Churches, but were general *Viſitors* or Overſeers of many: Yet if the ſame Man who is fixed in a particular Church, have alſo the *viſiting admoniſhing overſight* of many as far as was an Ordinary part of the Apoſtles Office, and be called an Archbiſhop, I know no Reaſon to be againſt him.

XVII. There be *eſſential* and *Integral* Acts of the Sacred Miniſtry inſtituted by Chriſt: Theſe none may take the Power of from any Miniſters, nor alter the *ſpecies* or *integrity* of the Office, by ſetting up any ſuch Superiors as ſhall deprive them of that which Chriſt hath inſtituted, or arrogating the like uncalled. But as in *worſhip*, ſo in *Order* and *Church Government*, there are undetermined accidents: As to chooſe the time and place of Synods, to preſide and moderate and ſuch like: And theſe the Churches by agreement, or the Magiſtrate may aſſign to ſome above the reſt: And if the Magiſtrate affix Baronies, Honours, Revenues, or his own due Civil forcing Power, and make the ſame Men Magiſtrates and Miniſters, whether we think it prudent and well done or not, we muſt honour and obey them.

XVIII. Some call theſe *humane Accidental Orders*, *forms of Church Government*, and affirm (as Biſhop *Reignolds* did, and Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his Irenicon and many excellent men by him cited) that no *form* of Church Government is of *Divine Command*. Which is true of all this ſecond ſort of Government which is but Accidental and humane; but not at all of the firſt ſort which is Divine and Eſſential to Chriſt himſelf firſt, and to Paſtors as ſuch by his appointment; ſo that the eſſential Government of the Univerſal Church, by Chriſt, and of each particular Church by Paſtors ſpecified by him (if not of Superviſors of many as ſucceeding Apoſtles and Evangeliſts in their Ordinary work) are of unalterable Divine right. But the humane forms are alterable: Such I account 1. The Preſidency and Moderatorſhip and accidental Government of one Biſhop in a ſingle Church over the other Presbyters, Deacons, *&c.* 2. The accidental Government of a Dioceſan as an Archbiſhop over theſe loweſt Biſhops and Churches. 3. And the Superiority of Metropolitans and Patriarchs over them, ſo it be but in ſuch *Accidentals* and within the ſame *Empire*, not impoſing a forreign Juriſdiction. Theſe *toca ſpecie* differ from the Divine Offices.

XIX. All theſe ſingle Church being parts of the Univerſal are leſs noble than the whole, and are to do all that they do as members in Union with the *Whole*, and to do all as Acts of Communion with them.

XX. The

XX. The General precepts of doing all to Edification, Concord, Peace, Order, &c. oblige all the Churches to hold such correspondencies as are needful to these Ends: And Synods are one special means, which should be used as far and oft as the Ends require: And if National Metropolitans and Patriarchs order such Synods, I am not one that will disobey them. But if on these pretences any would make Synods more necessary than they are, and use them as Governours, by Legislation and Judgement over the Particular Bishops by the use of the Church Keyes, and will affixe to them or Metropolitans, besides an *Agreeing Power* and the said *Government* in Accidentals, a proper Church Government by *making and unmaking Ministers* or *Christians*, *excommunicating* and *absolving* as Rulers by the said Keyes, it may be a duty to disown such usurpations. As the King would disown an Assembly of Princes any where met that would claim a Proper Government of him and his Kingdom; Thô it were much to be wisht that all Christian Princes would hold such Assemblies for the Concord and Peace of Christendom.

XXI. The Essentials of Faith, Hope and Loving Practice, essentiate the Church objectively: And these are all summarily contained in the Baptismal Covenant, explained in the Creed, Lords Prayer and Decalouge; and all with much more, even Integrals and needful Accidentals in the Sacred Scriptures, which taking in the Law of Nature, are Gods Universal Law.

XXII. There is no Church on Earth so sound and Orthodox as to want no Integral part of Christian Religion: Proved: There is no man on Earth, much less any multitude, so sound as to want no Integral part: But all Churches consist only of Men; And therefore if all the Men be so far defective, all the Churches are so.

It is not their *Objective Religion* Generally and implicitely received that I mean, but their *Subjective Religion*, and their explicite reception of the Objective. The Scripture is our perfect Objective Religion in it self, and as an Object proposed, and in general and implicitely we all receive it. But as a man may say, I believe all that's in the Scripture, and yet be ignorant of the very Essentials in it; so a man may explicitely know and believe all the Essentials and more, and yet be ignorant of many Integrals.

All things in Scripture proposed to our Faith, Hope and Practice, are the Integrals of our Religion: But no Christian understandeth all these proposals or words of Scripture: Therefore no Christian explicitely believeth them all, or practiceth all. To hold the contrary, is to hold that some Church is perfect in Understanding, Faith, Hope and Practice, without Ignorance, Errour or Sin: that is, not to know what a man or a Christian on Earth is.

XXIII. Much less do all Churches agree in unnecessary indifferent accidents, nor ever did, nor ever will or can do.

XXIV. The measuring out Churches by limits of Ground, Parochial or Diocesan, is a meer humane ordering of a mutable accident, and no Divine Determination: And if all were taken for Church members because they

d well in thoſe precincts, it were wicked: But if it be but all in thoſe precincts that are qualified Conſenters, it is uſually a convenient meaſure: But ſuch as in many Caſes muſt be broken.

XXV. If a Church with Faithful Paſtors be well ſetled in a place firſt where there are not more than ſhould make up that one Church, it is not meet for any there to gather a diſtinct Church (thô of the ſame Faith) without ſuch weighty reaſon as will prove it neceſſary, or like to do more good than hurt: 1. Becauſe Love inclineth to the greateſt Union; 2. Becauſe a Great Church is more ſtrong and honourable than a ſmall, if the number be not ſo great as to hinder the Ends. 3. And the Ancient Churches kept this Union.

XXVI. If Magiſtrates make ſuch Laws about Church Accidents as tend to further the Churches welfare, or are ſo *pretended*, and not *againſt it*, we muſt obey them. But if they will either *invade Chriſts Authority* or *croſs it*, by making Laws *againſt his*, or ſuch as are *proper to his Prerogative* to make, or invade the *Paſtors Office*, and the *Churches proper right* given by Chriſt, or determine Accidents to the *Deſtruction of the Subſtance* (the Church, Doctrine, Worſhip or Ends) theſe bind the Conſciences of none to Obedience; but Chriſt muſt be obeyed, and we muſt patiently ſuffer.

XXVII. Self-intereſt, Self-Government and Family-Government are all antecedent to Publick Government, which Ruleth them for the Common good, but hath no Authority to deſtroy them: No King or Prelate can bind a man to do that which would damn his Soul, nor to omit that which is needful to his Salvation: All power is for Edification: They are Gods Miniſters for Good.

XXVIII. As it belongs to ſelf-government to chooſe our own Dyet, and Cloaths, and Wives, and Phyſicians, (thô we may be reſtrained from doing publick hurt on ſuch pretences;) And it belongs to Family Government to educate our own Children, and chooſe their Tutors, Callings, Wives, *&c.* ſo it more nearly belongs to ſelf-government to chooſe the moſt ſafe and profitable means of our own Salvation, which no man may forbid us; and to avoid that which is pernicious or hurtful; and to Family-Government to do the like for our Children.

XXIX. It is falſe Doctrine of thoſe late Writers who tell us, that only Sacraments ſanctifie or give right to Salvation: The whole Tenor of the Goſpel tells us that men are brought to Faith and Repentance, and to be Chriſtians, and Godly men, and by Faith to be juſtified, by the Preaching of the Goſpel: and that Gods word is his appointed means of Salvation, which his Miniſters muſt preach skilfully, inſtantly, in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon, to that End: And if the Goſpel be hid, it is hid to them that are loſt.

XXX. The Goſpel ſaveth not like a Charm, by the bare ſound or ſaying of the words; nor the Sacrament like an Amulet; But as a Moral means (ſpecially bleſt by him that inſtituted it) to work on man as Man, by informing

ming his Mind, perſwading his Will and exciting his Affections, as Men are wrought on in other Caſes; (which methinks thoſe called Arminians ſhould leaſt deny, who are ſaid to lay more of the Spirits operation on Moral ſuaſion than their Adverſaries; yea and thoſe that account it Fanaticiſm to expect any other gift of Prayer from the Spirit but what is given morally by uſe.) And the contrary Doctrine feigneth God to Work even conſtantly by Miracle: And as the Papiſts make every Maſs-Prieſt a Miracle Worker in Tranſubſtantiation, ſo do they that make the bare ſaying over the Words and doing the outward Acts in the Sacrament, to ſave us *ex opere operato*, and the Paſtoral teaching and overſight of an ignorant drunken Lad or Reader to be (near) as great a help to Salvation, as the Miniſtry of a wiſe skilful, Holy and exemplary Paſtor, and the clear affectionate Preaching of Gods word: And that tell us (as Mr. *Dodwell*) how ſufficient a man is to adminiſter the Sacramental Covenant that underſtands what a Covenant is in matters of Common Converſation.

XXXI. If a Wiſe and Skilful and Conſcionable Miniſtry be as needleſs to Edification and Salvation as ſome Men pretend, it is as needleſs that they ſhould ſtudy to be ſuch, and vain to Glory that they are ſuch, and that the Church of *England* hath ſuch a Miniſtry, and vain to expect that men ſhould pay them any more reſpect than I owed my Maſter that never preacht but once, and that drunken; (and divers very like him.) Or that they ſhould uſe this as an argument to draw men to hear them.

XXXII. If the King or Law ſhould ſettle a Phyſician of his (or a Patrons) choice in every Pariſh, it were well done if it be but to have help at hand for Volunteers: But if he command all to uſe them and to uſe no other before them or againſt them, where unskilful or untruſty men are placed, no man is bound to obey this command: No mens Law can diſſolve the Law of Nature, nor diſoblige a man from a due care of his Life, nor bind him to caſt it away upon Obedience to ignorant or bad and treacherous Men. And a mans Soul is more precious than his Health or Life; and he is bound to greater care of it; and is no more to truſt it on the will of his Superiours How vaſt is the difference between an ignorant raſh Phyſician or Paſtor, and one that is wiſe, experienced and truſty? They that ſcorn Men for going for *greater edification* from one to another, do not ſo if a man prefer a skilful Phyſician to one that kills more than he cures; or a skilful and careful Tutor for his Son, yea or a Farrier for his Horſe.

XXXIII. If one Preacher be not for Edification to be greatly preferred before another, then *One Book* is not: And ſo it's no matter what Book they read or value; and what a Student will this make? And what a Trade for the Bookſellers? And why then ſhould their own Books be ſo valued? And why then do they ſilence hundreds or thouſands and forbid them to preach on pain of ruine, (thô no falſe Doctrine be proved againſt them) if they think not that the difference is very great.

XXXIV. When Councils hereticated and condemned Thousands or Hundreds of Priests and Bishops, whom Christian Emperours and Princes owned as Orthodox, they did not then think every Patron, Prince or Prelate a competent Judge with what Pastor Men should trust the conduct of their Souls: Nor did they think so that forbad men hearing fornicators; Nor *Cyprian* that required the People to forsake *Basilides* and *Martial* (*& Peccatorem Præpositum.*)

XXXV. So full was the proof given in the Book called, *The first Plea* for *Peace*, that the Church from the beginning denyed Princes and Magistrates to be entrusted with the choice of Bishops, or Pastors to whom the Churches were bound to trust the conduct of their Souls, that he who denyeth it, is not worthy to be therein disputed with. And yet we doubt not but they may force Infidel Subjects and Catechumens to hear sound and setled Preachers and Catechists; And may dispose of the Tythes, Temples and many other Accidents of the Church; and may drive on Pastors and People to their Duty.

XXXVI. It is false Doctrine that *two distinct Churches* may not be in the same Precincts or City; This being a meer Accident which abundance of Cases make unnecessary and unlawful: Which I shall prove.

That which is no where commanded by God, is no duty: But that there shall be but one Church (or Bishop) in the same Precincts, is not commanded of God, *Ergo*, &c. (Divine of Gods making.)

They own the Major in the case of *Indifferent* thing. If they deny the Minor let the affirmers prove any such command. We grant a command of Love and Concord, and a prohibition of all that is against them. But in many instances, to have several Churches in the same precincts, is not against them.

If they fly to the Canons of foreign Councils, the reason of them we shall weigh and duely regard; But they were National, and had their Legislative Power only from their own Princes and their Counselling Power only from Christ: And we disown all foreign Jurisdiction.

XXXVII. In all these Cases following (and more) two Churches may be in the same precincts (yea and a City.)

1. In Case that several Bishops are called justly to dwell in the same City, or Dioceſs, and many of their Flock be with them, *e. g.* Many Bishops of *England* dwell long, yea mostly in *London* or in *London* Dioceſs: *e. g.* The Bishop of *Ely* dwells in the Parish of St. *Andrews Holbourn*: *Qu.* Whether there he be a Subject to Dr. *Stillingfleet* as his Pastor, and bound to obey him? or whether many out of his Dioceſs (thousands) may not as Lawfully dwell half the Year in *London* as he? And whether when he preacheth to them, he do it not as their Bishop (in *London* Dioceſs.) And so of many other Bishops that here reside.

XXXVIII. 2. Either our Parish Churches are true Churches, or not. If not,

not, the Separatiſts are ſo far in the right; And ſeparate not from true Churches *eo nomine* becauſe they ſeparate from them. If yea, then many Churches are in the ſame City and Dioceſs. (Of their agreement and dependance on the ſame Biſhop I ſhall ſpeak anon.)

XXXIX. 3. In caſe that in one City there be reſident Stranges, that are ſent on Embaſſies, or live for Merchandize, or flee from Miſeries, and are the Subject of other Princes, whoſe Laws and Cuſtoms they are under, *e.g.* At *Frankford*, *Hamburgh*, *Middleburgh*, *Dantzick*, *Conſtantinople*, there have been Engliſh diſtinct lawful Churches: And in *London* there are *Dutch* and *French* Churches: And if the King allowed a *Swediſh* Church, a *Daniſh* Church, a *Saxon* Church, &c. with their ſeveral Biſhops, who is ſo weak as to need proof that this is lawful, and they true Churches?

XL. 4. In caſe men of different Language are not capable of mutual converſe by perſonal communion or help: As *Dutch*, *French*, *Italian*, *Greeks*, *Germans*, &c. *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* (oft in *Diſſert.* and *Annot.*) do maintain that *Peter* at *Rome* had a Church of *Jews*, and *Paul* a Church of *Gentiles*: And that the like diſtribution of Churches of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, there was at *Antioch*, *Alexandria* and other places: And by this they Salve the Contradictions in Church Hiſtory about the Succeſſion of *Linus*, *Cletus* and *Clemens*: And the Apoſtles ſetled not a ſinful Church way.

XLI. 5. Yea *Grotius* maintaineth that the Apoſtles ſetled the Churches at firſt not like the Jewiſh Prieſthood, but in the order of their Synagogues; (*de Imper. ſum. Poteſt.* and in *Annot.*) And that as there were divers Synagogues in a great City with their *Archiſynagogus* and Elders, ſo there were divers Churches in a City with Biſhops and Presbyters.

XLII. 6. When there are a greater number of Perſons in one City or precinct than can have any juſt perſonal Knowledge and Communion, and more than any one Biſhop with his Presbytery can perform the needful Paſtoral overſight to, it is lawful and a duty, to gather another Church in that City or Precinct: But this is truly the Caſe of many great Cities, though worldly Wiſdom have at *Rome*, and other places oft denyed notorious evidence and experience. He that will gather up all the duties that Dr. *Hammond* ſaith were charged on the Biſhops (in his Annotations on all the Texts that name Elders and Biſhops) if he can believe that any Biſhop can perform the tenth part of them to all in the Dioceſs of *London*, *York*, *Lincoln*, *Norwich*, &c. I will not diſpute againſt him if he maintain a Biſhops Ubiquity, or that at once he can be in twenty places. But if they ſay, that what then was commanded them to do perſonally, they may do by others, I ſay, that if they may change the *Work*, they may change the *Power*, that ſpecifieth the Office; and ſo it is not the ſame Office in *ſpecie* inſtituted in Scripture: And then Lay-men may have Power to preach and adminiſter Sacraments, and do the Office of Prieſts, and yet be no Prieſt (as Civilians do of Biſhops) which is a Contradiction. Certainly if there be more Scholars in the City than

than one Maſter can Teach and Rule, it is no Schiſm to ſet up more Schools and Schoolmaſters, but a duty. And if the Lord Mayor on pretence of City Government ſhould put down but as great a part of Family Government, as thoſe Dioceſans do of Parochial Church Government, who allow none under them to be truly *Epiſcopi Gregis*, and have the power of their Church Keyes, I think that it were no Schiſm to reſtore Families ſo that the City might have more than one (entirely.)

XLIII. 7. If the Soveraign Power upon Politick or Religious Reaſons ſhould determine, that *e. g.* Dr. *A*, and Dr. *B*, and Dr. *C*. ſhall all be Biſhops in *London*, to ſuch Volunteers of Clergy and Laity as ſhall chooſe each of them to be their Biſhop, and this without altering their dwellings, no man can prove it ſinful; And of his reaſons the King is judge.

XLIV. 8. If the Biſhop or Clergy of a City, Dioceſs or Nation, do agree by Law or Canon to admit none to the Miniſtry or Communion that will not commit a known ſin deliberately as the Condition of his Communion, it is a duty to congregate under other Paſtors in thoſe precincts. This is confeſt: If they ſhould not only hold any errour, or practiſe ſin, but require men to ſubſcribe and approve it, and ſay it is no ſin, no man ought to do this; nor yet to live like an Atheiſt, and forſake all Worſhip becauſe men forbid him, if it were but to ſubſcribe one untruth: But alas, this is no rare Caſe: In one Emperours Reign all were Anathematized that ſubſcribed not to the Council of *Chalcedon*, and quickly after all that did, or that would not renounce it: The ſame diviſion and changes were made by the Councils againſt and for the Monothelites, *de tribus Capitulis*, Images, *&c.* And when all Men living have many Errours, and the Church of *England* diſclaimeth her Infallibility, and yet will receive no Miniſter that will not ſubſcribe that there is nothing in her Books contrary to the word of God, the Caſe is hard. But when all the things mentioned in the *Plea for Peace* are proved lawful, we ſhall be more yielding in this Caſe.

XLV. 9. If true and ſound Chriſtians miſtakingly think one or many things to be heinous ſins, (as Perjury, Lying, Renouncing Obedience to God, and Repentance, *&c.*) which are things indifferent, but of ſo great difficulty that moſt Learned and Godly and Willing Men cannot diſcern the Lawfulneſs and agree, and yet are not neceſſary nor juſt conditions of Miniſtry or Communion, and ſo it is the Impoſer that entangleth them by difficulty in their diſſent, it is not lawful for theſe men therefore to forbear all Church Worſhip, but muſt uſe it as they can.

XLVI. 10. If any Church unjuſtly excommunicate ſuch men; or others, they muſt not forbear all Church order and worſhip becauſe men ſo excommunicate them. No man muſt Sin to eſcape Excommunication; and every man in the World is a ſinner; And therefore all the World muſt be excommunicated, if all Sinners muſt be ſo. As I before ſaid, the times oft were when almoſt all the Biſhops in the Empire were excommunicated by one another:

ther: Councils and Popes have oft excommunicated ſome for trifles and ſome for Truth and Duty. And ſuch muſt not therefore renounce all Church Worſhip and Communion.

The Church of *England* do by their ſtanding Law *ipſo facto* excommunicate all (as aforeſaid) that affirm any thing to be repugnant to Gods Word or ſinful, in their whole Church Government, Articles, Liturgy and Ceremonies, and ſo to ſtand till they Publickly revoke this as a wicked Errour. Now many Lords and Commoners in Parliaments, have ſpoken againſt ſome of theſe particulars; and ſome out of Parliament: Many Miniſters have done the like when the King Commiſſioned them to treat for Alterations; And many when the Accuſations or demands of others have called them to give a Reaſon of their Actions. Some have maintained that it is repugnant to Gods word that Lay Civilians ſhould have the decretive Power of the Keyes, and that the Pariſh Miniſter muſt caſt out of Communnion all that the Lay Doctors or Chancellors excommunicate, and all that dare not receive kneeling, and that they ſhould deny Chriſtendom to all that ſcruple the Engliſh ſort of God-Fathers Covenants, and the tranſient Symbolical Image of the Croſs, with abundance ſuch things: Now all theſe are *ipſo facto* excommunicate. And thô they be not bound to avoid the Church till this be applicatorily declared, yet *actually excommunicate* they are, and that by a higher authority than the Biſhops; and they know the Churches decree; and the Prieſts are ſworn to Canonical Obedience; And he that will not tempt them to be forſworn, nor come into a Church that hath excommunicated him, ſeems therein excuſeable: But muſt he therefore renounce the Church of God?

XLVII. 11. If the People are ſo ſet againſt one Biſhop for another, as that half being for one and half for the other, and both Orthodox, they cannot be perſwaded to unite in one. A Council at *Rome* determined in the Caſe of *Paulinus* and *Flavian* at *Antioch*, that both of them ſhould hold their diſtinct Churches, and ſo live in love and peace. And though one or both parties in this were miſtaken Sinners, ſo are all morral men, who yet muſt not live like Atheiſts.

XLVIII. 12. An undetermined accident muſt be ſo determined as moſt ſerveth to do the greateſt good and avoid the greateſt Evil: But whether divers Churches ſhall promiſcuouſly live in the ſame City or Dioceſs or Pariſh, is an Accident not determined by God, and either way may be for the greateſt good, as circumſtances vary. *e. g.* When in a Church half cannot conſent to condemn the words of *Theodoret*, *Theodore Mopſueſt*, and *Ibas*, and half will condemn them with the Council; if theſe can ſerve God quietly in Love and Peace in different Congregations, but cannot endure one another in the ſame, it is moſt for the Churches Peace that they be permitted to joyn with thoſe of their own Mind.

When one Pope declared that it's ſound Doctrine to ſay [*One of the Trinity was Crucified,*] when another had declared that it is *not ſound Doctrine*, they

they that held with one Pope, and they that held with the other might both be true Churches in different Aſſemblies: When *Juſtinian* raiſed the bloody controverſie between the *Corrupticolæ* and the *Phantaſiaſtæ*, wiſe men thought both ſides were true Churches: Yea and ſo did many wiſe men think of the Orthodox and *Neſtorians* and many *Eutychians*.

XLIX. 13. It's a common caſe under Turks and Heathens, that they give liberty of Conſcience for Chriſtians of all parties: Now ſuppoſe that in *Aleppo*, in *Conſtantinople* or elſewhere, there be (partly for Countrey ſake, and partly for Language, but moſt for different Judgments) one Church of *Armenians*, one of *Greeks*, one of *Engliſh-men*, &c. what Law of God makes only one of theſe to be a true Church, and which is it?

L. 14. Suppoſe that the ſetled Church *e. g.* in *Holland*, *Sweden*, *Saxony*, is for Presbytery, or for an Epiſcopacy that aroſe from Presbyters ordination, or that had none or a ſhort Liturgy, and the Prince would tolerate Engliſh men (as *Frankford* did) to ſet up a Church of the Engliſh Form and Liturgy, I think few Prelatiſts would deny it to be lawful.

LI. I omit other inſtances, and come to the matter of *Separation*, which word ſerveth this man and ſuch other in ſo general and undiſtinguiſhed a ſence, as would make one think he were of Mr. *Dodwell*'s mind, *That words in diſpute have but one ſignification, which all are bound to know that uſe them.* Even a Bell by the ſame ſound ſometime ſignifieth a call to Church, and ſometime a Funeral, and ſometime Joy; but [*Separate*, *Separate*] is rung over and over with theſe men, as if it ſignified but one thing.

1. He that heareth half the Sermon and Service, and goeth out of Church, doth *Separate* at that time from the reſt.

When a Proteſtant Heretick was doing Penitence with his Faggot at St. *Maries* in *Oxford*, and the Fryer was Preaching, a miſtaken Voice in the ſtreet made them think the Hereticks had ſet the Church on fire, and they *ſeparated* from the Preacher, one Fryer ſtuck by the belly that was going out at the window; the door being wedged with the crowd, a Boy that ſaw it open above their heads, got up on their ſhoulders, and went on 'till he ſlipt into a Monks Cowl, and there lay ſtill 'till the Monk was got out, and felt ſomething on his back, and thinking it was an heretical Devil, began to conjure him in the Name of Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, to tell him what he was, and the Boy cryed, *O good Maſter I am the Bakers boy*, &c. Quære, Whether this was *Schiſmaticks ſeparation*.

At *Walſall* in *Stafford-ſhire*, Mr. *Lapthorne* (known to me in his luſty age) who had been a Non-conformiſt, but thought it an honour to be converted by a King, and gloried that King *James* in conference changed him; but being as ruſtick a thunderer as Father *Latimer* and more, he was wont to let fly without much fear; one Mr. *Martin* in the Pariſh accounted the greateſt enemy to Puritans, when he heard what he liked not, would goe out of Church; one day (in a path way where Mr. *Lane* had rode a little before)

pelt-

pelting Crabs with a pole, the ground opened and ſwallowed him and his pole, that they could never be found (being a Cole-mine long on fire:) ever after that, when any one would goe out of Church at a bluſtering paſſage, Mr. *Lapthorne* would call to him, *Remember Martin*; Quere, Whether all theſe were ſeparating Schiſmaticks?

But this is too far off: In *Dunſtans* Weſt, where Dr. *Sherlock* Preacheth, when I was licenſed twenty years ago, at *Chriſtmas*, as I was Preaching, ſome Lime or Stone fell down in the Steeple with the crowd, the Church being old and under ſuſpicion, they all thought it was falling, and moſt ran out in tumult, and ſome caſt themſelves headlong from the Gallery for haſt; when they were quieted and came in again, the Boyes in the Chancel broke a Wainſcot Skreen with climbing on it, and the noiſe made them run out again; one old woman going out, cryed, It's juſt with God becauſe I took not the firſt warning, Lord forgive me, and I'le never come again: Quere, Whether theſe, or at leaſt this reſolving Woman was a Schiſmatick, and ſeparated from the Catholick Church?

If not, there is ſome ſeparation that is not ſo bad as Murder; and methinks the Doctor ſhould forgive it for the ſucceſs; for the Pariſh hereupon reſolved to pull down the Church and build it new, a far better Fabrick where the Dr. now Preacheth; and it drove me away that I preacht there no more; Whether this new Church built where the old one had poſſeſſion before, be not a Schiſmatical Separatiſt, I leave to him.

LII. 2. *Local* Separation without *Mental* can make no culpable Schiſm; for *Nil niſi Voluntarium eſt morale*; if a man be impriſoned or be ſick and cannot come to the Church, it is innocent Separation; I have been at no Church this half year, much againſt my will, O that God would heal me of this Separation!

LIII. 3. If it muſt be *mental Separation* that muſt be culpable, then it is diverſified according to the mental degree and kind; and no man ſeparateth from the univerſal Church who ſeparateth not from ſomewhat *eſſential to* it; to ſeparate from its *Integrals* or *Accidents* may be culpable, but it's no *Separation from the Church*, no more than every breach of the Law is a Separation from the Kingdom.

LIV. 4. Some ſeparate as to place, locally and not mentally, ſome mentally and not locally, and ſome both: He that daily obſerveth the outward Communion of the Church, and yet taketh it for no Church, or denyeth its Faith, Hope or eſſential Duty, ſeparateth indeed. All thoſe men that live unbelievingly, atheiſtically, wickedly, that in their converſe prate againſt the Scripture and immortality of the Soul, and that hate and perſecute ſerious Godlineſs, are damnably ſeparated from Chriſt, and therefore from the Catholick Church, and are ſo to be eſteemed ſo far as this is known, thô when it is unknown, the Church can take no notice of it.

LV. 5. It being only *Humane Laws* and *Circumſtantial Conveniences* that

make it unmeet to have divers Churches and Biſhops living promiſcuouſly in the ſame Pariſhes, Cities, Dioceſes or Nations; where Laws and circumſtances allow it, it is no unlawful ſeparation.

LVI. 6. He that liveth in forreign Lands (Chriſtian, Mahometan or Heathen) where various Churches live promiſcuouſly (*Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Proteſtants*, *Papiſts*, &c.) is no Schiſmatick, if he chooſe which he thinks beſt, and be abſent locally from the reſt, condemning them no further than they deſerve.

LVII. 7. He that removeth into another Dioceſs or Pariſh for his worldly intereſt, ſeparateth without fault from the Church he was in.

LVIII. 8. It is a lawful ſeparation to remove ones dwelling, becauſe the Miniſter is ignorant, unskilful, or otherwiſe bad, and this for the better edification of his Soul, and the uſe and help of a more able faithful Miniſter, even Law and Cuſtome and reaſon do allow it.

LIX. 9. Thó the Canon 57. and 28. forbid Miniſters oft to give the Sacrament to Strangers that come out of other Pariſhes, even where no Preaching is, yet thoſe many ſober People that uſe this in *London*, are not taken to be Schiſmaticks, as bad as Murderers: Many that are eſteemed the moſt ſober religious Conformiſts do ordinarily goe from their own Pariſh Churches, ſome (in *Martins* and St. *Giles*'s Pariſh, *&c.*) for want of room, and ſome for more Edification, to Dr. *Tillotſon*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, Dr. *Burnet*, Dr. *Fowler*, Mr. *Gifford*, Mr. *Durham*, Mr. *Horneck* and ſuch others, and communicate with them; and thó theſe are called by the late Catholicks by the Name of *Dangerous Trimmers*, I think even Dr. *Sherlock* will think it more pardonable than *Murder*, if they come to *him*.

LX. 10. If the King and Law ſhould reſtore the antient order that every City, that is, every great incorporate Town in *England* ſhould have a Biſhop, (yea or every great Pariſh) and that the Dioceſans ſhould be their Arch-Biſhops, and our new Catholicks ſhould tell the King and Parliament that they are hereby unchriſtened Schiſmaticks, as dangerous as Adulterers or Murderers, for gathering Churches within a Church, I would not believe them.

LXI. 11. If (*e.g.* at *Frankford*, *Zurick*, *Lubeck*, *Hamburgh*, &c.) a Church is ſettled in the *Lutheran* way, and another in the *Bohemian* way, deſcribed by *Laſitius* and *Comenius*, (which is a conjunction of Epiſcopacy, Presbytery and Independency) or a Church that had no Liturgy, or none but that which the French Proteſtants and Dutch have, would it be damning Schiſm, for ſuch as *Cox* and *Horne* at *Frankford* to ſet up an Epiſcopal Church in the Engliſh mode, and with their Liturgy, and ſo far to ſeparate from the reſt?

LXII. 12. If it be true that *John Maior*, *Fordon*, and others ſay that Presbytery was the Government of the Church of *Scotland* before Epiſcopacy was brought in, was the introduction of Epiſcopacy by *Palladius* a damning Schiſm

Schiſm by ſeparating from the former, or a Reformation; is juſt Reformation Schiſm?

LXIII. 13. When the Church firſt ſet up Patriarchs, Metropolitans, General Councils, Monaſteries, Pariſh Churches diſtinct from Cathedrals, Organs, New Liturgies, and multitudes of Ceremonies, this was a departing or ſeparating from the contrary Church way which was there before, was it therefore Schiſm?

LXIV. 14. When *Socrates* tells us of ſome Countreys that had Biſhops in the Countrey Villages (like our Pariſhes) was it a damning Schiſm to ſeparate from this cuſtome, by decreeing that even ſmall Cities ſhould have no Biſhops, *Ne vileſcat nomen Epiſcopi?* or when the *Chorepiſcopi* were put down, where they had been?

LXV. 15. If a man ſeparate not from any thing eſſential to the Church of *England*, he ſeparateth not from that Church, though he refuſe that which is its Accidents, or ſome Integral parts: We are charg'd with ſeparating from the Church of *England*, as if it were a matter of fact beyond diſpute, and ſcorn'd for denying it, even by them that will not tell us what they mean by the *Church* of *England*, or by *Separation*. By the Church of *England* we mean the *Chriſtian Kingdom* of *England*, or all the Chriſtians in *England*, as living in one land, under one Chriſtian *King who Governeth them by the Sword*, which includeth their Concord among themſelves in true Chriſtianity; we are Chriſtians, we profeſs agreement in Chriſtianity with all Chriſtians we are under the ſame King as they are, and profeſs ſubjection, and take; the ſame Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy; yea, we are not charged with differing in any thing called Doctrinal from their Thirty Nine Articles; but we diſown certain late Covenants and Oaths which are not Twenty three Years old, and the Subſcription to one Canon about the Innocency of all in their Liturgy; now either theſe new Oaths, Covenants and Canon, Liturgy and Ceremonies are eſſential to the Church of *England*, or not; If yea, then, 1. It's a poor humane Church, made by them that made theſe Oaths, Liturgy and Ceremonies. 2. And then it's a new upſtart Church, and no man can anſwer the Papiſts where it was before *Luther*, or before *Henry* 8. yea, if its eſſentials were made by this King and Parliament, 1662. then the preſent Church is no older: But if theſe things be *indifferent*, or *not eſſential* to the Church, then to ſeparate only from theſe, is not to ſeparate from the Church.

If it be ſaid, *That for the ſake of theſe we ſeparate from the Church it ſelf, and therefore from its eſſence*; we abhor the accuſation, and challenge them to prove it: If we ſeparate from the Church eſſentially, it is either *Locally* or *Mentally*; not *Locally*, for we are yet in *England*, nor is *Local diſtance only* a ſin; not *Mentally*, for we own it for a true Chriſtian Kingdom, called *a National Church*, bound to ſerve Chriſt in Love and Concord to their Power: We deny not the King to be the Governour, nor Chriſtians to be Chriſtians, no

nor the particular Churches and Miniſters to be true (thô culpable) Churches and Miniſters, nor their Sacraments to be true Sacraments; we profeſs to hold with them one Catholick Body, one Spirit, one God, one Chriſt, one Faith, one Baptiſm (in the eſſentials) and one Hope, and are ready to promiſe to live in Concord with them in all other things, as far as will ſtand with our Obedience to God; ſo that we ſeparate not from the Church of *England as ſuch*, but from ſome of its *Accidents*, which we dare not be guilty of.

LXVI. 16. The ſame I ſay of a *Pariſh Church*; he that locally removeth, *e. g.* from a Church that hath *Organs*, to one that hath none, ſeparateth from a pair of Organs, but not *Mentally* from the Church, unleſs the Organs be its eſſence.

LXVII. 17. They that are for the true antient Epiſcopacy, (*e. g.* as much as Arch-Biſhop *Uſher*'s Reduction which we offer'd did contain) but diſlike the Lay Civilians power of the Keyes, and Officials, Surrogates, Arch-deacons Government, *&c.* do not ſeparate from the Church as Epiſcopal, but from the humane Novelties which they diſown.

LXVIII. 18. If a Pariſhioner fall out with his Prieſt, and they goe to Law about Tythes, Glebes, Words, *&c.* and the Suit be long, and the man dare not Communicate with him believing that he hateth him, thô the animoſity ſhould be culpable, being but perſonal, his going from him to another Church is not ſeparating from Chriſt; (for I hope that even Mr. *Dodwell* himſelf will not ſay that every Prieſt is Chriſt.)

LXIX. 19. *Ex quovis ligno non fit Mercurius*, ſurely there is ſome qualification eſſential to the Miniſtry; if a man want that qualification, it is a Duty to ſeparate from him as no Miniſter, *e. g.* When I came to *Kederminſter*, (after my ſubjection to ſix or ſeven worſe) I found the Vicar, one reputed ignorant of the Fundamentals, (he was brought in by Sir *Henry Blunt* a Papiſt) who Preacht but once a quarter, which moſt thought he might better have forborn, and his Curate Mr. *Turner* at *Mitton* Preacht once a day, whom I found ignorant of the Catechiſm Principles by Conference, and he confeſt he had but one Book, *Muſculus common places in Engliſh*, and he ſaid ſome of that to the People, and they took it for a Sermon; he lived by unlawful Marrying, infamous for Drinking and Quarrelling; he that had taken theſe for no Miniſters, and ſeparated from them, had not thereby ſeparated from Chriſt or his Church Catholick.

LXX. 20. If it prove as hard to know who is the true Paſtor in a competition of Pretenders, as it was to know which was the true Pope, when there were two or three, (above twenty times) or whether, *e. g. Optandus* was true Biſhop of *Geneva* that knew not Letters, or whether Duke *Heriberts* Son conſecrated in Infancy was Arch-Biſhop of *Rhemes*, or any other Infant conſecrated be a Biſhop, (officiating *per alios*, *Surrogates*, *Chancellours*, *Officials*, &c.) it is not here a Separation from Chriſt to ſeparate from either of the

the Pretenders: He that miſtaketh not, is not liable to the Charge, he that miſtakes, doth not erre in an Article of Faith, but in a difficult point of humane title, and the qualification and right of a ſingle man; and my Opinion is, that if ſuch a title were tryed before our Judges or King, and they ſhould miſtake and give Judgment againſt him that had right, this were no ſeparating from Chriſt, nor proof that they are Infidels.

LXXI. 21. If the Caſe of two contending Biſhops or Presbyters come before a General or Provincial Council, and they miſtake and give it to the wrong, and ſo ſeparate from the right, I do not think that thereby they ſeparate from Chriſt or the Church Catholick, *e. g.* The Conſtantinopolitan Council firſt gave the Church of *Conſtantinople* to *Nazianzene*, and after judged him out as having no right; if by this they ſeparated from Chriſt, they that take them for the Catholick Church repreſentative, muſt ſay that the Catholick Church ſeparated from Chriſt and it ſelf.

When another Council wrongfully depoſed *Chryſoſtome*, and ſeparated from him, and *Cyril Alexandr.* perſwaded the continuance of it, did the univerſal Church ſeparate from it ſelf and Chriſt? If a General Council which ſhould be wiſeſt, be excuſable from damning Schiſm, whenever it misjudgeth and ſeparateth from a rightful Biſhop, ſure every Lay-man and woman that doth the ſame, doth not ſeparate from Chriſt.

If it prove that a General Council depoſed *Neſtorius* as unjuſtly as *David Derodon* thought, or *Dioſcorus* as unjuſtly as others thought, or *Flavian* as unjuſtly as the Orthodox think, this proveth them Guilty of ſome Schiſm, but not of ſeparating from the univerſal Church.

When *Menna* of *Conſtantinople*, and the Pope excommunicated each other, when a Synod in *Italy* renounced *Vigilius*, and all his Succeſſors were an hundred years depoſed from their Primacy, and a Patriarch at *Aquileia* ſet up in his ſtead for a great part of *Italy*, becauſe *Vigilius* ſubſcribed to a General Council, *de tribus Capitulis*, this was Schiſm (ſomewhere) but not ſeparating from Chriſt.

LXXII. 22. If a man in *England* ſhould think that all the old Councils were obligatory, which decree that he ſhall be taken for no Biſhop that comes in by the choice (yea or Mediation) of Courtiers, Princes or great men, or any that have not the true Conſent of Clergy and People, and thereupon ſhould conclude that Biſhops, Deans, Prebends, *&c.* ſo choſen and impoſed are Lay-men and no true Biſhops and Paſtors, this were a ſeparating from *thoſe Perſons*, but not from *Chriſt* and the *Univerſal Church*, when as Mr. *Thorndike* ſaith, that *till the right* of *Electing* Biſhops *by the Clergy* and *People be reſtored, we need look no further for the reaſon of the Contempt of Epiſcopacy here.*

So if a man think that God never truſted every Ignorant Wicked man that can but get Money and buy an Advowſon, to chooſe thoſe Paſtors to whoſe conduct all the People are bound to truſt their Souls, (and the Biſhop to admit

mit them for fear of a *Quare impedit*, if they have but a Certificate and can ſpeak Latine) This is not damning Separation.

LXXIII. 23. If a Biſhop ſet up a ſeeming Convert, really a Papiſt (*e. g.* Mr. *Hutchinſon* alias *Berry*, or one of them that lately Confeſſed themſelves Papiſts,) the People that find by experience what the man is, are not damned Schiſmaticks for not taking him for their Paſtor, or for going from him.

If *Godfrey Goodman* Biſhop of *Glouceſter* was a Papiſt, did he ſeparate from Chriſt that ſeparated from the Dioceſan Church of *Glouceſter*, while he was an Eſſential part? Or that did not implicitely truſt all the Prieſts that he ordained?

LXXIV. 24. If in a Cathedral Church one withdraw from their Service, becauſe of their difference in ſinging, Ceremonies, *&c.* from the Pariſh Churches, thô it be the Biſhops Church that he ſeparateth from, it is not as a Church, nor from any thing eſſential to it, *e. g. Miles Smyth* Biſhop of *Glouceſter* (the famous *Heoricus*, and chief in our Bibles Tranſlation) declared and performed it, that he would never come more to his Cathedral, becauſe the Dean (in *Laud.* time) kept up the Altar. *Qu.* Whether he ſeparated from himſelf or his Church? *Ubi Epiſcopus ibi Eccleſia*: Who were the Separatiſts? They that followed the Biſhop, or they that ſeparated from him and kept to the Cathedral? The ſame I ſay of *Williams* Biſhop of *Lincoln* that wrote againſt Altars.

LXXV. 25. If faithful Paſtors and People are ſetled in concord, and the higher Powers make a Law to depoſe and eject them without juſt cauſe (as Multitudes were in many Emperours dayes, and Multitudes by the *Interim* in *Germany* in *Charles* the fifths time; and Multitudes in the Palatinate by *Ludovicus*, and in too many other Countreys) thoſe that leave the Temples and Tythes to the Magiſtrate, but cleave to their old Paſtors in forbidden meetings (called Conventicles) ſuppoſing the Paſtoral Relation not diſſolved (as the *Joannites* clave to *Chryſoſtom*) do not thereby ſeparate from the Catholick Church: Had the Power been lawful that ſet up another way, when Dr. *Gunning* kept up his Meetings at *Exeter* Houſe, it had not been a Separation from Chriſt that he then made.

LXXVI. 26. If the Law command all to take one man for his Paſtor, and a Parent command his Child, or a Husband his Wife to take another and not that, and the Child or Wife know not which ſhould be obeyed, and whether the choice belong more to the Domeſtick, or the Publick Government, it is not a ſeparating from Chriſt, which way ever ſuch an one ſhall go.

LXXVII. 27. Yea if I ſhould think that ſelf-Intereſt and ſelf-Government bind me rather to chooſe a Paſtor for my ſelf, than to ſtand to ſuch a choice by Prince, Patron or Prelate, which I think intolerable, as well as (againſt their will) I may chooſe a Wife, or a Phyſician, or a Tutor, or a Book, or

my

my daily food, this is not ſeparating from the Univerſal Church.

LXXVIII. 28. If owning the ſame Dioceſan make them of one Church who differ more than Nonconformiſts and Conformiſts do, then owning the ſame Chriſt, Faith, Scripture, *&c.* maketh them of one Catholick Church who differ leſs. But, *&c. Jeſuites, Dominicans, Janſeniſts*, and all the Sects of Papiſts are taken for one Church, becauſe they own the Pope and Councils. In *England* the Dioceſan Conformiſts are taken for one Church, thò ſome of them are as much for a Foreign Juriſdiction, as Arch-biſhop *Laud*, Arch-biſhop *Bramhall*, Biſhop *Gunnings* Chaplain, Dr. *Saywell*, Mr. *Thorndike*, Dr. *Heylin*, and many more, have manifeſted in their words and writings. And ſome that ſubſcribe the Articles of General Councils erring in Faith and againſt Heathens Salvation, and againſt free will, and for Juſtification by Faith only, *&c.* do ſhew that they differ in the Doctrines of Religion, (unleſs the ſound or ſyllables be its Religion) while one and another take the words in contrary ſences. Some are for Dioceſans being a diſtinct Order from Presbyters, ſome (as *Uſher* and many ſuch) deny it: Some hold them to be of Divine Right, and ſome but of humane; ſome think the King muſt chooſe them, ſome rather the Clergy and People; ſome hold them Independent, others rather ſubject to the Arch-biſhops and Convocation; ſome think all that bear Office in their Church Government are lawful, others think Lay-Civilians Government by the Keyes unlawful (and ſo are *ipſo facto excommunicate* by their own Canons;) ſome that promiſe Canonical Obedience to their Ordinary, take the Judges of the Eccleſiaſtical Courts for their Ordinaries; and others only the Biſhops; ſome think they are ſworn to obey their Ordinaries, if they rule according to the Canons (and ſo to pronounce all Excommunicate that the Canon excommunicates, if commanded;) Others think otherwiſe, that they are judges themſelves whether the Canons command *licita & honeſta*; ſome take the Pope to be Antichriſt, and the Church of *Rome* no true Church; others think otherwiſe. Many more (Arminian and other) ſuch differences there are, and yet all of one Church, both Catholick, National, Dioceſan and Parochial (oft:) Much more are thoſe Nonconformiſts that differ from the Church in nothing but what the Impoſers call Indifferent.

LXXIX. 29. If one that prayeth in the Litany againſt falſe Doctrine and Schiſm, and readeth the Conformiſts telling him of the danger of it, ſhould verily think that Dr. *S.* printeth and preacheth falſe Doctrine, and ſuch as plainly tendeth to ſerve Satan againſt Chriſtian Love and Peace, and to the moſt Schiſmatical dividing and damning of Chriſtians, ſhould hereupon ſeparate from him for fear of Schiſm and falſe Doctrine, and go to a ſafer Paſtor, I think it were not to ſeparate from Chriſt.

LXXX. 30. If a Biſhop in any Dioceſs in *London* ſhould openly write or plead for a Foreign Juriſdiction, and we are told that none are true Miniſters

ſters that depend not obediently on the Biſhop, he that for fear of the Law, or of Perſonal or common perjury, ſhould ſeparate from that Biſhop and his numerical Dioceſan Church, doth thereby neither ſeparate from the Catholick Church, nor from the Church of *England*. As if the Kings Army ſhould have a Colonel that declared himſelf an obliged Subject to the King of *France* and bound to obey him, the Regiment may forſake that Colonel. Yea if the General of the Kings Army ſhould give up himſelf in ſubjection to the Enemy or a Foreign Power, and ſay, I *will take a Commiſſion from* the *Turk*, and my *Officers ſhall only obey me*, and the *Soldiers* obey them, were not this an Army of Traytors or Rebels, though none but the General took a Commiſſion from the Enemy? So if the Biſhops ſhould all take Commiſſions from the Pope, or declare themſelves Subjects to a Forreign Juriſdiction, it were no ſeparating from Chriſt, to ſeparate from them all, in Loyalty to Chriſt, and to avoid National perjury and Schiſm.

LXXXI. 31. If a man think that he is bound to uſe all Chriſts inſtituted means of Salvation, and live in a Church that wilfully omitteth any one of them, *e. g.* either Infant baptiſm, or ſinging Pſalms, or Praying, or Preaching, or the Lords Supper, or all Perſonal care, and diſcipline to exclude the groſly intolerable, to reſolve the doubting, *&c.* He that in Obedience to Chriſt goeth to a Church and Paſtor (in the ſame Dioceſs or City) that omitteth none of theſe, is no damned Schiſmatick.

LXXXII. 32. He that is unjuſtly caſt out of the Church, and by its very Laws excommunicated *ipſo facto*, is no damned or Sinful Schiſmatick for Worſhipping God in a Church that will receive him: Nor any one that is denyed Communion unleſs he will ſin; Much more if they ſhould prove half as many and great Sins as the Nonconformiſts have ſaid they fear (in the firſt Plea for Peace, *&c.*)

LXXXIII. 33. If a Foreigner that doth but half underſtand our language, withdraw to a Church and Paſtor whoſe tongue he underſtands, obeying God and Nature is no damning Schiſm.

LXXXIV. 34. If one that is erroneouſly conceited of the obligation of General Councils, ſhould think it a ſin to kneel at the Sacrament on any Lords day in the year, or any Week day between *Eaſter* and *Whitſuntide*, becauſe Tradition and the twentieth Canon of the firſt Council, and that at *Trull*, *&c.* do forbid then to adore kneeling, this ſeparating on that account to another Congregation is not damning.

If it be ſaid, that Mr. *Thorndike and others tell us that it is not neceſſary that we do the ſame things which the Supream Catholick Power commanded, but that we ſubject our ſelves to the ſame Power which may change their own Laws.* I anſwer, 1. The aſſerting of that Univerſal Soveraignty is the greateſt Crime and Hereſie of all. 2. By this it ſeems that our Religion is very mutable, and very uncertain, and a man hath need to take heed of obeying any old

Canons,

Canons, till he know the mind of the preſent Church; (and who thoſe be, and how to know it.) 3. But what if the ſame man read Dr. *Heylin* (of Sab.) telling him that this cuſtome againſt *Adoration-kneeling* continued a thouſand years, and was never revok't by any true General Council, but changed by little and little by mens practice: And what if he queſtion who thoſe Changers were, and whether their practice was Rebellion at firſt, and whether they had power to repeal the Canons of the greateſt Councils without a Council. Sure they that are for ſuch Councils univerſal ſoveraignty, when they have caſt men into theſe ſnares, ſhould ſcarce tell them that they are damnable Schiſmaticks, for joyning with ſuch Churches as obey theſe Councils, rather than with thoſe that ruine men for not diſobeying them.

LXXXIV. And now Reader if thou art one that thinkeſt of theſe things with Chriſtian Sobriety and impartiality, I appeal to thee whether if I ſhould be of the mind of Mr. *Dodwell*, and ſuch ſelf-conceited *Reſolvers*, I ſhould not write my own Condemnation, and be one of the groſſeſt Schiſmaticks that any Hiſtory hath mentioned, unleſs ever there were any man ſo mad as to hold himſelf to be all the Church: Yea, when he no more diſtinguiſheth of Separation and Schiſm, but involves almoſt all Chriſtians in his Condemnation, and tells us that Schiſm will damn us as ſoon as Adultery and Murder, is it not obvious for all men to infer that we are as *odious* as *Adulterers* and *Murderers?* and doth he not Preach Chriſtians into the *hatred* of *each* other? and can any wonder if Rulers ſhould think the Puniſhment of *Murderers* is not worſe than we deſerve? It is not *Newgate* only, but *Tyburn* that theſe healing men do ſeem to aſſign us; it would be too tedious to look over all theſe again, and ſhew you how great the number is that theſe men damn, and how few on Earth in any Age they excuſe from being ſo far like Murderers.

LXXXV. 1. It ſeems to me that he *virtually* damneth all Chriſtians on Earth as ſuch Schiſmaticks; for it is moſt certain that all men have ſin, and culpable imperfection in Knowledge, Will and Practice; and if any ſay, *That he hath no ſin, he is a Lyar*, ſaith St. *John*; and it is certain that all two perſons on Earth have many errours, and many differences from one another; it is certain that the Love and Duty of Chriſtians towards each other is culpably defective in all men: It is certain that no man living is ſo perfect in knowledge as to know all the *indifferent* things in the world, which may be impoſed, to be *Indifferent!* And long and ſad experience hath told the Church, that both groſs errours and ſins, and things called Truths or indifferent, which few can be ſure of, may be impoſed. What follows from all this, but that all men on Earth may eaſily fall under the imputation of diſobedience to Prelates, and ſo be Excommunicate, and then they have their choice (when no man is perfect, and they cannot change their mindes) 1. Whether they will be damned as Excommunicate

and practical Atheists that give over all Church Worship; 2. Or as damnable Schismaticks, for worshipping God in Churches when they are excommunicate; 3. Or as perfidious Lyars, that will make false Confessions, Professions and promises, to get off an Excommunication. When Mr. *Dodwel* numbers those with Schismaticks that [*suffer themselves to be excommunicate,*] if they have no other means in their Power to hinder it, it seems these great Enemies to absolute reprobation, do think all Christians being unavoidably born to imperfection of Knowledg, are as unavoidably born to damnation whenever Prelates or Priests please thus to precipitate them.

LXXXVI. 2. Particularly, 1. The first and second Canons *ipso facto* excommunicate all that say [*that any manner of Obedience and Subjection within his Majesties Realms and Dominions is due to any usurped and foreign Power :*] By this all Papists and all pretended Protestants(such as Dr. *Barrow* confuteth) who hold any manner of Obedience and Subjection due to Pope or Foreign Councils, are Excommunicate.

2. Those that say that the *Book of Common Prayer containeth any thing in it repugnant to the Scriptures, are* ipso facto *excommunicate.* Which now by the new Laws are interpreted of the present Books.

3. In this all are excommunicate who say, the *Mis-translations* (in Psalms, Epistles or Gospels, of which many instances have been given) to be *any thing repugnant in the Scripture.*

4. And all that say, It is against the *Scripture to deny Christendom to all Infants that have not such Vowers in their Names* and for *their Education* as we call *Godfathers, and Godmothers,* thô the Parent (who is forbidden it) offer his Child by Sponsion.

5. And all that say *it is against Scripture to deny Christendom to all that refuse the Covenanting transient Images of a Cross.*

6. And all that say that it is *against Scripture* for all Ministers to profess [*that it's certain by Gods Word that baptized Infants* (without exception) *so dying* are *undoubtedly saved*] when no word of God is cited that saith it, and adding to Gods word is dreadfully threatned, and when it's certain that *all Ministers are not certain* of any such thing (and I think no one.)

7. All are *ipso facto excommunicate* that say, It *is against Gods Word to deny Church Communion in the* Sacrament *to all that dare not take it kneeling,* for fear (thô mistaken) of breaking the second Commandment by Symbolizing with Idolaters, that are seeking to reduce the Nation to their Sin, and that live round about us.

8. All are excommunicate that say *it is against Scripture* to *pronounce* all saved that are buryed, except the unbaptized, self-murderers and the excommunicate, while thousands of Sadducees, Hobbists, Infidels, Papists, Perjured, Adulterers, Drunkards, *&c.* dwell among us.

9. By the fifth Canon all are *ipso facto* excommunicate that say, [*Any of the Articles are in any part erroneous, or such as they* (perhaps as doubters)

may

may not with a good Conſcience ſubſcribe to,] and conſequently all the aforeſaid Conformiſts that think the ſence erroneous while they ſubſcribe thoſe words and ſhall affirm, *e. g.* that *Canons are made neceſſary to Salvation*; thô the *matter cannot be* proved *by Scripture*, contrary to Art. 6.

Thoſe that contrary to Art. 8. ſay, any *thing in* Athanaſius *Creed may not be ſubſcribed.*

Such as Biſhop *Taylour* that againſt Art. 9. *deny Original Sin.*

Thoſe that ſay contrary to Art. 10. that the Word [*no Power*] excludeth *Common natural Power*, or maketh *Nature* to be *Grace.*

Thoſe that write againſt our being *accounted righteous, only* for *Chriſts merits*, and ſay that another ſubordinate Righteouſneſs is named many hundred times in Scripture, contrary to Art. 11.

Thoſe that contrary to Art. 13. ſay, that *works done before the Inſpiration of the Spirit may make men meet to receive Grace.*

Thoſe that with Dr. *Hammond* write for works that are not *commanded* but *counſelled*, and Free-will-offerings, contrary to Art. 14.

All they that take *Infants and new baptized Perſons to have no ſin*, contrary to Art. 15.

All that ſay, that *after we have received the H. Ghoſt, we cannot depart from Grace* given, contrary to Art. 16.

Thoſe that deny the Doctrine of Election, in Art. 17.

Thoſe that ſay, any on Earth may be ſaved by diligent living according to the light of Nature, without knowing the name of Chriſt, contrary to Art. 18.

Thoſe that contrary to Art. 19. reject that Deſcription of a viſible Church, which reacheth to ſuch as our Reſolver damneth.

All that contrary to Art. 20. ſay, that the Church [*may not enforce any thing to be believed for neceſſity to Salvation, beſides the Scripture*] even thoſe that ſay, it's neceſſary to Salvation, by avoiding Schiſm to believe that all impoſed Tyths, Covenants Practices, and Ceremonies are not ſin.

All that contrary to Art. 21. ſay, that *General* or other *Councils may be gathered without the command and will of Princes, and deny they may erre, and things ordained by them as neceſſary to Salvation have neither Strength nor Authority, unleſs it may be declared that they are taken out* of *Holy Scripture.*

Thoſe that deny Art. 23. that *thoſe are lawfully called and ſent* into the Miniſtry, *who have publick Authority given them in the Congregation, to call and ſend Miniſters into the Lords Vineyard, are choſen and called* hereto, (for want of Canonical Succeſſion.)

Thoſe that contrary to Art. 24. would have Gods Worſhip performed to them that underſtand not the language, to avoid the Schiſm of having many Churches in a City.

Thoſe that take Confirmation or Penance, or the other three for Sacraments of the Goſpel contrary to Art 25.

Thoſe that contrary to Art. 26. would not have it believed to be the Peoples duty, who know the Offences of Bad Miniſters, to accuſe them.

All that contrary to Art. 27. are againſt Infant Baptiſm, as agreeable to Chriſts Inſtitution.

All that contrary to Art. 28. ſay, the Body of Chriſt is given and taken and eaten in the Sacrament otherwiſe than in a Spiritual manner by Faith.

All that ſay, that *in ſome wiſe* the *wicked are Partakers of Chriſt in the* Sacrament, contrary to Art. 29.

All that contrary to Art. 30. ſay, *There is other ſatisfaction for Sin beſides Chriſts Blood.*

All that ſay, that Men juſtly Excommunicate may be *reconciled* and *received by the multitude without open penance* (which is ordinary) contrary to Art. 33.

All that contrary to Art. 34. think that a General Council may ordain ſuch Traditions or Ceremonies as ſhall in all places be one or the like: and that every Particular or National Church may not aboliſh thoſe Ceremonies or Rites which the General Council or Colledge ordained.

Many things in the Book of *Homilies* [eſpecially againſt peril of Idolatry] are blamed by many Conformiſts, contrary to Art. 35.

All that contrary to Art. 36. ſay, that the Book of Ordination wants ſome things neceſſary.

All that contrary to Art. 37. think that Pope or foreign Biſhops have any Juriſdiction by right in this Land: And all that (by miſtake) ſay, the King hath not chief Power in all his Dominions, meaning in *France*, of which he profeſſeth to be King, and we ſo call him even in our Prayers to God.

All that ſay, contrary to Art. 38. that it is not their Duty *liberally to give Alms, according to their ability.*

All that contrary to Art. 39 think men in conforming may ſwear upon truſt of their Superiours words, without judgment, and true underſtanding of Juſtice and Truth.

All theſe are already *ipſo facto* Excommunicated by this one Canon, and if they elſewhere worſhip God, are called Separatiſts and Schiſmaticks, in danger of Damnation, as Adulterers and Murtherers are: And how great a number are theſe?

10. All are *ipſo facto Excommunicate* by the ſixth Canon, who affirm, that the *Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of* England, *by Law eſtabliſhed, are ſuperſtitious, or* ſuch as *(now commanded) men who are zealouſly and godly affected, may not with a good Conſcience APPROVE, uſe and ſubſcribe as occaſion requireth.* That is, all that thus miſtake *kneeling* at the Sacrament, on the reaſons aforenamed, to be againſt the ſecond Commandment, or that judge ſo of the Surplice, or that think the Croſs, as deſcribed by the Canon and Liturgy, hath all the Eſſentials of a humane unlawful Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace. And all that are againſt the Rites of Godfathers that never owned the

Child

Child as theirs, to be theonly Sponſors in its Name, and to Vow its Chriſtian Education (when I never knew one living that ſo much as made the Parents believe that he intended it:) And all that think the words of the Liturgy (making *Impoſition of hands an aſſuring ſign of Gods Gracious acceptance*) make *Confirmation* a humane unlawful *Sacrament*, and ſay ſo. All theſe are cut off.

11. By Canon ſeventh all are *ipſo facto* excommunicate that affirm, that the *Government of the Church of* England, *under his Majeſty, by Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, Deans, Archdeacons*, and THE REST THAT BEAR OFFICE in the *ſame, is repugnant to Gods word*; that is, all Biſhops, Miniſters, Noblemen, Gentlemen or People, that ſay that it is againſt Gods word for Lay Civilians or Chancellours to govern by the Church Keyes, excommunicate or abſolve: And all that think it unlawful for Surrogates that are not Biſhops but Presbyters, either as a Cryer *pro forma* to pronounce all excommunicate or abſolved who are ſo decreed by the Lay Chancellor, or elſe for them (or a Prieſt-Chancellour) to govern a Dioceſs by the Keyes of Excommunication and Abſolution being no Biſhops; and all that think it ſinful for Archdeacons, Commiſſaries, Officials, *&c.* who are no Biſhops, to exerciſe the ſame Government by the Keyes over ſo many Paſtors or Churches, or for a Biſhop to do his Office by others that are no Biſhops, any more than a Prieſt by thoſe that are no Prieſts; or for a Dioceſan with his Lay Court, to Govern many ſcore or hundred Churches under him, without any ſubordinate Biſhop in thoſe Churches, that is, to ſet up the Name and ſhew, and make Chriſts Diſcipline impoſſible: Or for Lay Chancellors or Surrogates to publiſh Excommunications in the Biſhops Name, which he never knew of, nor tryed the cauſe: Or for ſuch Chancellours to oblige all Pariſh Miniſters to publiſh all their Excommunications which are agreeable to theſe Canons. What quality and number they are of that call any of this ſinful, I pretend not to know: But they are all now excommunicate men.

12. The eight Canon *ipſo facto* excommunicateth all that affirm that the *form and manner of making and conſecrating Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons hath any thing repugnant to Gods Word*, &c:] That is, all thoſe that hold Biſhops and Presbyters to be the ſame Order (contrary to the words of that Book.) Which yet even the Church of *England* while Papiſts declared in King *Ælfriks* Canons (ſee *Spelman:*) And all ſuch as *Thorndike*, who ſay the People and Clergy ſhould chooſe their Biſhops; or that ſay the Peoples conſent is neceſſary to the Paſtoral Relation to them, and that the old Canons for this are in force.

13. The ninth Canon *ipſo facto* excommunicateth the Separatiſts.

14. The tenth Canon excommunicateth all that *affirm* [*that Miniſters that refuſe to ſubſcribe to the Liturgy*, &c. *and their Adherents may truely take to themſelves the Name of another Church, not eſtabliſhed, by Law and dare publiſh that this their pretended Church hath long groaned under the burden* of impoſed *grievances, by the Church of* England, and the *Orders and Conſtitutions therein by Law eſtabliſhed.*]

eſtabliſhed.] (*Ipſo facto* is not here.) This reacheth to all that confine not Gods Church in *England* to the Party that ſubſcribe and their Adherents: If any ſay, that if ſuch as *Blondel*, *Rivet*, *Ameſius*, or any other the moſt Learned, holy, peaceable men that dare not ſubſcribe as aforeſaid, ſhould with any Chriſtians worſhip God together, and that theſe are a true Church (though he judge them faulty) and that theſe Canons are grievances, ſuch are to be excommunicated: (Though it be groſs Schiſm in others to confine not onely the *Purity* but the *Verity* of a Church to their own Party:) For ſuch to *feel* and *groan loud* here is Excommunication.

15. The eleventh Canon much to the ſame purpoſe requireth the Excommunication of all that affirm that any *Subjects* in *England* may rightly challenge the Name of *true* and *lawful Churches* beſides thoſe allowed by Law, though the King ſhould Licenſe them..

16. The twelfth Canon *ipſo facto* excommunicateth all, that *make Rules and Orders in Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical without the Kings Authority, and ſubmit to them*, e. g. All that without the Kings authority agree to turn the Table Altarwiſe, to require People to kneel at the Rails, or to bow toward the Alter or Eaſt, or to ſet up Organs, *&c.* All theſe are now excommunicate by an Authority above the Biſhops, which no Biſhop or Prieſt can diſpenſe with (but only forbear to publiſh and execute it, but not nulliſie it) no nor abſolve any that publickly repent not of it as a wicked Errour.

16. By Canon fourteenth if any Miniſter ſhall *diminiſh* any part of the *Orders*, *Rites*, *Ceremonies*, Prayers, *&c. in regard of Preaching or ANY* OTHER RESPECT, or ſhall *adde any thing in matter or form*, (e. g. If he let the Parent *expreſs* the *dedication* of his *Child to God*, or lay any charge on any Parent) he breaketh the Church Law, and ſo far ſeparateth from it.

17. By Canon fifteenth when twenty or thirty thouſand are commanded to come to a Church that cannot receive ſix thouſand, and the Alleys and Pewes are wedg'd ſo that they cannot all kneel, yet all that kneel not at the Prayers, and all that ſay *not audibly* the *Confeſſion*, *Lords Prayer*, *Creed* and *Reſponſes*, diſobey the Laws of the Church, and ſo far ſeparate from it.

18. When twenty thouſand Perſons are commanded to come in more than can, if ten thouſand of them (or any number) ſhould come to the Church-yard or Porch, to ſhew that they are not preſentable, but would get in if they could, the nineteenth Canon commands to drive them away.

19. The Liturgy and Canon 22. *&c.* bind all under the penalty of the Law to receive the Sacrament thrice every year: If a ſecret Infidel, Sadducee, Hobbiſt, Socinian, or any Heretick ſay, *I am not able to change my Judgment, which is inconſiſtent with the Sacrament*, or if one whoſe Conſcience tells him of the guilt of Adultery, and that he is not reſolved to confeſs and forſake it yet; or one that by Melancholy cauſeleſsly feareth unworthy receiving to damnation; I ſay, if any of theſe will avoid the charge of

Schiſm,

Schiſm, they muſt run upon worſe, till grace recover them, which is not at their command. And yet all notorious Offenders are prohibited it Canon 26. and particularly the Perjured: And if the tenth part ſo many be perjured in *England* in City and Countrey, as many fear, it's a very great number that are uncapable of Comm union with the Church.

20. By Canon twenty ſeventh on pain of Suſpenſion no *Miniſter muſt wittingly adminiſter the Communion to any but ſuch as Kneel, or to any that refuſe to be preſent at publick Prayers*; &c. So that all that Kneel not in receiving are rejected, and if they worſhip God elſewhere, muſt be taken for Schiſmaticks, as dangerous as adulterers or murderers.

21. The twenty eighth Canon forbids admitting ſtrangers to Communion, and commands ſending them home to their Pariſh Churches: It's diſobedience to violate this.

22. The twenty ninth Canon forbids *urging Parents to be Preſent when their Children are baptized, and admitting them to Anſwer as Godfathers for their own Children; and any Godfather to make any* other Anſwer *or ſpeech* than the *preſcribed*.

23. The thirtieth Canon deſcribeth the Croſs as a Sacrament, as ſeemeth to us.

34. By the thirty ſixth Canon no man muſt be a Miniſter that ſubſcribeth not that the Book of *Common Prayer and Ordination contains nothing in it contrary to the Word of God*, and that *he himſelf will uſe no other form in publick Prayer and adminiſtration of the Sacraments*: By which all that refuſe this, or that uſe the forms made and impoſed by the Biſhops on occaſions of publick Faſts and Thankſgivings, ſeem all to be under diſobedience to the Church.

35. By Canon fourty ninth no Perſon not Licenſed as a Preacher, may *in his Cure or elſewhere, expound any Scripture, or Matter or Doctrine*, but onely ſhall ſtudy to read plainly the Homilies: So that all Miniſters before Licence to preach, all School-maſters, all Parents, or Maſters, that do expound to their Schollars, Children or Servants, the meaning of Baptiſm, or of any Article of the Creed, any Petition of the Lords Prayer, any one of the Ten Commandments (to fit them for Confirmation, or Salvation) otherwiſe than by plain reading the Homilies or Church Catechiſm, doth diſobey the Law of the Church: And ſo do all Tutors in the Univerſities that expound any Scripture, matter or Doctrine to their Pupils, before they are examined or approved by the Biſhop; or any Judge on the Bench or Juſtice that preſumeth to do it to the hearers, or any Friend or Neighbour in diſcourſe: For it is [*No Perſon whatſoever not examined and approved by the Biſhop of the Dioceſs.*] How few in *England* ſeparate not from the Church as far as this diſobedience amounts to? If by [no *Perſons*] be meant only [*no Miniſters*] it's hard enough, that Miniſters may not be allowed out of the Church what Lay-men are allowed.

36. All thoſe that deny not the validity of Baptiſm or the Lords Supper when they are done by an unpreaching Miniſter, but yet think that a man utterly

utterly unable to Teach otherwiſe than by Reading, may not lawfully be encouraged in ſo high a function, (any more than a man in Phyſick or School-teaching that hath not neceſſary skill, or is utterly illiterate,) and thinks it a ſin to conſent to take ſuch an Ignorant fellow for the Paſtor of his Soul if he can have better; If this man, I ſay, go to the next Pariſh Church for Sacraments, he is to be ſuſpended firſt and next excommunicate: Specially if he ſhould judge that Ignorant Reader, no true Miniſter for want of neceſſary capacity.

37. Surplices, Hoods and Tippets are made the matter of Obedience, Canon fifty eighth.

38. By Canon thirty eighth no Miniſter muſt *refuſe or delay* to Chriſten any Child (without exception) *according to the form* of the *Common Prayer, that's brought to Church to him on Sundaies or Holy-daies*, though the Parents be both *Jewes* or *Heathens* or Atheiſts or Sadducees: The Miniſter muſt be ſuſpended that refuſeth it.

39. The ſeventy firſt Canon ſuſpendeth all *Miniſters that Preach in any private houſe* (except to the ſick or impotenti n time of neceſſity.) By which had *Paul* here preached publickly and from houſe to houſe, or *Timothy in ſeaſon* and *out of ſeaſon* as dreadfully adjured, or Chriſt preacht as he oft did, they muſt be ſuſpended: And every Miniſter that preacheth to his Family: And no doubt, repeating his Sermon, is preaching the ſame again.

40. All *Miniſters* muſt be *ſuſpended* and then *excommunicate*, that *without the Biſhops Licence appoint or keep any ſolemn Faſts publickly or in private houſes, other than by Law appointed, or be wittingly preſent at any:* Though it were in time of Plague, or when divers of his Neighbours are ſick or troubled in Conſcience, or in preparation to a Sacrament, or on ſome great occaſion in Noble-mens Houſes and Chappels: He is not to be truſted to faſt and pray with his own Flock or Friends, or come among them, leſt being excommunicate he be a damn'd Schiſmatick.

The ſame prohibition is for *holding meetings for Sermons called Exerciſes:* Which Arch-Biſhop *Grindall* was zealous to ſet up, (*Q.* Was he then a Schiſmatick? or is the damning dangerous Engine made ſince?)

41. By Canon ſeventy thi d *if any Miniſters meet in any privat ehouſe* (as many did by conſent in 1660. and 1661.) to *do any thing that any way tends to impeach the Common Pr . r or any part of the Government and Diſcipline* (e. g. to Petition King or Parliament for the leaſt Reformation of it) he is excommunicate *ipſo facto.*

42. Canon ſeventy fourth brings all Miniſters apparel under Church Laws, for the Shape.

43. Canon ſeventy ſixth Excommunicateth all that *voluntarily relinquiſh their Miniſtry*, and uſe themſelves as a Lay-men. And man having free will, that is done *voluntarily*, which is done in Obedience to mens command: And yet we are ruined in the World, if we will not leave our Miniſtry, at their Command.

44. It's

44. It's tedious to go over all the reſt: I end at the end of them. Canon 139. excommunicateth all them that affirm that the Synod is *not the true Church of* England *by Repreſentation*: that is, 1. All that take it for the *Church real* and not *Repreſentative*, leſt they make the *diffuſed Church* (*People* and all) to be Chief *Church-governours*, while Convocations govern but as *their Repreſentatives*. 2. All that ſay, that it is only the *Biſhops* and not the Presbyters in Convocation that are the Governing Canon-making Church. 3. All that ſay that the Clergy repreſent not King, Nobles, Parliaments, Laiety, and that theſe are *true parts* of the *Church of* England. All theſe are *ipſo facto* excommunicate.

45. The 140. Canon Excommunicateth them that deny the Canons obligation of abſent Diſſenters, which yet even many Papiſts deny of Councils Canons.

46. The laſt Canon Excommunicateth all that contemn theſe Canons, as taking them to be *the work of a Company of Perſons that conſpired againſt Religious Godly men*. All this huge Catalogue are here excommunicate.

47. If any part of all this be Schiſm, Mr. *Dodwell* and this man ſeem to teach Separation from the Church of *England*: Or if the late ſilencing, hunting and ruining of two thouſand Miniſters were Schiſm, and as bad as Biſhop *Taylor* in *Duct. Dubit.* Mr. *Hales* of *Eaton*, *Chillingworth*, &c. ſay of the like, then theſe men make all the Church of *England* to be in as damnable a State as Adulterers and Murderers. Yea they make all damnable Schiſmaticks that hold Communion with the Church of *England*; for that is their Sentence on them that communicate with Schiſmaticks; *viz.* that they are guilty of their Schiſm.

48. They unchurch and damn the Churches of *Corinth*, *Galatia*, *Laodicea*, *Epheſus*, *Smyrna*, &c. in the Apoſtles dayes: For the Scripture tells us of many guilty of Schiſm in all theſe, and yet the reſt communicated with them; for the Scripture ſpeaks more of *Schiſm in a Church*, than of *Schiſm or Separation from a* Church, *Rom.* 16. 17. 1 *Cor.* 1. 10. & 3. 3. & 11. 18. *Mat.* 12, 25. *Luke* 12. 52, 53. 1 *Cor.* 12. 25. *Jam.* 3. 15, 16. And yet no one was commanded to ſeparate from thoſe Churches; no not from thoſe that had Hereſies among them, ſuch as denyed the Reſurrection, and taught Fornication, and eating things offered to Idols, that were drunk at the Sacrament or Love-Feaſts, nor thoſe that had Jewiſh Schiſmaticks, who talkt like ours, *Act.* 15. *Except ye be circumciſed and keep the Law of Moſes, ye cannot be ſaved*: The Churches were not all unchurcht and damn'd that communicated with ſuch. Yea *Peter* was guilty of encouraging them in Schiſm, that would not eat with the Chriſtian Gentiles, but he was not unchriſtened by this.

49. They ſeparate from or unchurch almoſt all the Ancient Churches in the dayes of the moſt famous Emperours and Councils: For I have manifeſted paſt doubt that they almoſt all did Hereticate or ſeparate from one another. It was Schiſm either in *Victor* to Excommunicate the *Aſi-*

an Biſhops, or in them to deſerve it and be excommunicate. The owning or diſowning ſeveral Councils, ſpecially that of *Calcedon* and that at *Conſt. de tribus Capitulis*, &c. was the Schiſm of almoſt all the Imperial Churches; one part condemning the other. And if either were in the Right, it ſalves not the Caſe with them: For moſt of the ſame men that went that way call'd the Right in one Princes Reign, went contrary in the next, and ſo condemned each other round; eſpecially about Images adoration.

50. Hereby they cut off that Succeſſion of that ſort of Ordination, which they ſay muſt be uninterrupted, while it came down from Churches excommunicated by one another, or make the Proof of it impoſſible.

51. They ſeparate from all the *Greek* Church at this day, as guilty of Schiſm, both in their Succeſſion from Schiſmaticall Biſhops, at *Conſtant. Alexand. Antioch*, *Jeruſalem*, &c. and in their excommunicating not only the Church of *Rome* for a wrong cauſe (the *filioque*) but other Churches, and for divers Acts of Schiſm.

52. They muſt by their Principles Separate from the *Abaſſines*, *Ægyptians*, *Syrians*, and all the Eaſtern and Southern Churches that are called *Jacobites*, and *Neſtorians*: For Councils and other Churches condemn them: And they condemn the Councils of *Epheſus*, and *Calcedon*, and all ſince: And they muſt ſeparate from and condemn the Churches of *Armenia*, *Georgia*, *Circaſſia*, &c. becauſe they ſeparate from others, and are ſeparated from.

53. Their Principles utterly unchurch the Church of *Rome*, 1. Eſpecially becauſe it is guilty of the greateſt Schiſm on earth, by ſetting up a falſe Church form and head: 2. And becauſe they Schiſmatically condemn and Unchurch three parts of the Church on earth, even all ſave their Sect: 3. And for their many other Schiſmatical Doctrines and Practices: 4. And as being condemned by the *Greek* Proteſtants and moſt Churches, and ſeparated from by the Church of *England* which they own.

54. They ſeparate in Principles from all or near all General Councils (ſave the firſt) as having ſeparated from other Councils and condemned them, and being again condemned by them.

55. Some of them condemn and ſeparate from all the Proteſtant Churches that have Biſhops, in *Sweden*, *Denmark*, *Germany*, *Tranſylvania*, &c. becauſe they had not their Ordination Succeſſively from Biſhops but Presbyters at the Reformation: And becauſe they have been guilty of Schiſm againſt others.

56. The Principles of Mr. *Dodwel* and his Aſſociates condemn the Church of *England* as Schiſmatical, 1. Thoſe that claim Succeſſion from *Rome*, whoſe own Succeſſion hath been oft and long interrupted, by incapacities and Schiſms. 2. For holding Communion with thoſe Proteſtant Churches which theſe men call Schiſmaticks.

57. They condemn and ſeparate from all the Churches called Presbyterian in *France*, *Holland*, *Geneva*, *Scotland* formerly, and thoſe in *Helvetia* that have no Biſhops; Thô ſome would threat kindneſs on them by ſaying that

that they would have them and cannot? And why cannot they?

58. Their Principles make the Biſhop of *Oxford*, *Briſtol*, &c. Schiſmaticks: For their Dioceſes are Churches taken out of Churches, being lately parts of other Dioceſes.

59. And they condemn all the Pariſh Churches in *England* as Churches diſtinct from Cathedrals: For they are all Churches gathered out of Churches: At firſt the Cathedrals were the only ſingle Churches: Next Monaſteries were gathered; and next our Pariſh Churches. And the Pariſh Church of *Covent-garden*, is a Church taken out of a Church.

60. Their Principles damn St. *Martin* that ſeparated to the death from all the Biſhops Synods and them that were near him (ſave one Man) becauſe they perſwaded *Maximus* to uſe the Sword againſt *Priſcillian Gnoſticks*, and brought men of ſtrict Religion under Suſpicion of Priſcillianiſm: And ſure the ruined perſecuted Proteſtants here, are more Orthodox than the *Priſcillians*. And they damn *Gildas* that told the Engliſh Clergy, that he was not *eximius Chriſtianus*, *that would call them Miniſters*; (Do they not diſgrace the many Churches dedicated to the Memory of St. *Martin*, if he be a damned man?) I doubt they damn *Paul* and *Barnabas* for local angry ſeparating from each other: Whatever they do by *Peter* and *Barnabas* for the Separation blamed *Gal.* 2.

61. If all are Schiſmaticks that here conform not, all thoſe called Conformiſts are ſuch, that conform to the words in a falſe ſence.

62. They ſeparate from all that obey the twentieth Canon of the Nicene Council: And from all that obey the Councils that forbid communicating with a Fornicating Prieſt: And from all that obey the Councils which nulliſie the Epiſcopacy of ſuch as are obtruded by Magiſtrates, or not conſented to by the Clergy and People. And many more ſuch.

Abundance more inſtances of their Separation, and Damnation, I might adde: In a word, I think their Principles are, as I firſt ſaid, for damning and ſeparating from all men living; for all men living are gulity of ſome ſort and degree of Schiſm, that is, of Errours, Principles or Practices in which they culpably Violate that Union and Concord that ſhould be among Chriſtians and Churches: Every defect of Chriſtian Love, and every ſinful Errour, is ſome degree of ſuch a violation. All Chriſtians differ in as great matters as things indifferent: And no man living knoweth all things Indifferent to be ſuch: And theſe men diſtinguiſh not of Schiſm, nor will take notice of the neceſſary diſtinctions given (in the third Part of the Treatiſe of Church Concord,) And *ſolutio continui* cauſeth pain: nor do they at all make us underſtand what ſort of Separation it is that they faſten on, but talk of Separation in general, as aforeſaid.

LXXXVII. They ſeem to be themſelves deceived by the Papiſts in expoſition of *Cyprians* words *de Unit. Eccleſ. Unus eſt Epiſcopatus*, &c. But they themſelves ſeem to ſeparate from *Cyprian* as a Schiſmatick, and conſequent-

ly from all the Church that hath profeſt Communion with him, and with all the Councils and Churches that joyned with him: For *Cyprian* and his Council erred by going too far from the Schiſm and Hereſie of others, nullifying all their Baptiſms, Ordinations and Communions: And for this errour they declared againſt the Judgment of the Biſhop of *Rome* and other Churches; and they were for it condemned as Schiſmaticks by the ſaid Biſhop: And here is a far wider Separation than we can be charged with. 2. And *Cyprians* words came from the Mind that was poſſeſt with theſe opinions, and are expreſſive of his Inclination. 3. Yet they are true and good, underſtood as he himſelf oft expounds them; the Biſhop of *Oxford* citeth ſome inſtances, many more are obvious, in which he oppoſeth the Biſhop of *Rome*, ſaying, that none of them pretendeth to be a Biſhop of Biſhops; and limiting every man to his own Province, and ſaying that they were to give account to none but God, with much the like.

But in what ſence is *Epiſcopacie one*? 1. Undoubtedly not as *numerically* in the *perſonal Subjectum Relationis*: One Biſhop is not another; if you ſhould ſay *Paternity is One*, none believe that one mans Relation of Paternity is anothers. The *Relation* is an accident of its own Subject, as well as Quantity, Quality, &c. 2. Nor doth any man believe that many Biſhops go to make up one Biſhop in Naturals. 3. Nor did ever *Cyprian* hold or ſay that all Biſhops go to make up one Politick Governing Ariſtocracie, as many go to make one Senate or Parliament, that hath a power of Legiſlation and Judgment by Vote as one *Perſona politica*. He never owned ſuch a humane Soveraignty.

But *Epiſcopatus unus eſt*, 1. *In ſpecie*, all Biſhops have one Office; 2. *Objectivè*: As the Catholick Church is one, whoſe welfare all Biſhops ought to ſeek: 3. And ſo *finaliter* as to the remote End; and are bound to endeavour Concord. 4. And as effects, all are from *one efficient inſtitutor*. As it may be ſaid that all *offecial Magiſtracy* in *England* is one: 1. As from one King or *ſumma poteſtas*: 2. As deſcribed by one Law, and as Juſtices of one *Species*: 3. As all their Cities and Counties and Hundreds are but part of one Kingdom, whoſe welfare all are for: 4. And as they are all bound to keep as much common Concord as they can; if any mean more, they ſhould tell us what: If any mean that all Biſhops make one numerical Univerſal Government, they are heinous Schiſmaticks, and the Kingdom is Sworn againſt their Judgment: And theſe Men damn them in damning Schiſmaticks.

The truth is, *Cyprian de Unitate Eccleſiæ* (leaving out the Papiſts additions) is a good Book, and worthy to be read of all; and take *Cyprian*'s Deſcription of the Epiſcopacy of the Church which we muſt unite with, and the nature of that Union, and we would rejoyce in ſuch. But if *Cyprian* had lived to ſee either *Arians* or *Donatiſts* the greater number, or any Sect after call themſelves the Church becauſe that Princes ſet them up, and had ſeen them depoſe *Chryſoſtome* and ſuch other, doubtleſs he would never have

pleaded

pleaded the Unity of Episcopacy for this, but have judged as he did in the Case of *Martial* and *Basilides*; nor did he ever plead for an universal humane Soveraignty.

LXXXVIII. If we are damned Schismaticks, I can imagine no pretended manner of Separation in which our Schism consists, but first, either Local as such. 2. Or Mental, as such. 3. Or Local, caused by Mental.

If Local, as such be it: All Christians are Schismaticks, for being locally separated from others, and absent from all Churches and places save one.

If *Mental Separation* be it, either all *Mental Division* is such, or but some only; if *all*, then all mortal men are Schismaticks, as differing in a multitude of things from others; If it be not all, what is it? is it all difference in the *Essentials of Christianity?* we grant it; and we are charg'd with no such thing. Is it all difference in the *Integrals* or *Accidents?* so do *all differ* that are not perfect. Is it all *want of Love*, or all *Uncharitableness* to one another? all on earth have some degree of it; and those are likest to have most, that do as the Bishops did against the Priscillianists, bring godly people under reproach, on pretence of opposing Heresie; or that seek the Silencing, Imprisonment, Banishment or Ruine of men as faithful as themselves: For our parts, we profess it our great Duty, to love all men as men, all Christians as Christians, all godly men as godly, all Magistrates as Magistrates, &c. Is it for our separating *in mind* from any *Principles in specie* necessary to Communion in the Church Universal, or single Churches? let it be opened what those Principles be: We own all *Christianity*, and all *Ministry of Gods Institution*, and *all his Church Ordinances*: We own *Bishops over their Flocks*, let them be never so large, so they be capable of the *Work* and *End*, and alter not the true *species*; and we submit to any that shall by the *Word admonish Pastors* of many Churches of their *Duty*, or *Sin*, or seek their good. Nor do we refuse Obedience to any humane *Officers* set up by Princes, to do nothing against Christs *Laws*, nor nothing but what is in *Princes power* in the *Accidents circa Sacra*.

Is it because we disown any *Numerical Rulers*? we own the King and his Magistrates; we own all that we can understand to be true *Pastors*; and if we are in *doubt* of their *Calling*, we resist them not, unless obeying Christ before them be resistance: But our Accusers loudly profess, that Usurpers are not to be owned; and if they go on the ground, that he hath *right that the Prince is for*, we would know, whether that hold in *Turky*, in *Italy*, *Spain*, *France*, or only in *England*, or where? If it be where *Princes are Orthodox*, do they make all the People Judges of their Princes Orthodoxness? And we would know, whether EVERY BISHOPS and PRIESTS right, as a true *Minister, called of God, and set over us*, be *necessary to Salvation*, to be believed or known by all the People? if it be, wo to us, that ever such men were set over us, whose right we cannot know: What abundance of things go to

make

make a Bishops or Priests right known! 1. That he hath *capable sufficiency*. 2. That he is a *just Bishop*, that's *chosen* by the *King*, *the Dean and Chapter obediently consenting*, & that the Clergy's and Peoples consent is unnecessary. 3. That the Diocesan *species* (over multitudes of Churches without any subordinate Bishop) is of Christ, or lawful. 4. That their *work*, according to the *Canon*, is lawful. 5. That all our *Patrons* have right to chuse *Pastors for all the People*. 6. That they are true *Pastors* over them that *consent not*. 7. That if they prove worse far than *Martial* and *Basilides*, and be owned by the Bishops as they were, the people may not forsake them (*plebs obsequens divinis præceptis*,) which faith *Cyprian have most power to chuse or refuse*.

Is every Christian bound on pain of Damnation to *know all these*, and then to examine and judge Bishops and Priests accordingly? or if they mistake one or more mens Commission, do they therefore separate from the Catholick Church? If so, what a case was the *East* in by the difference between *Chrysostome* and his Competitors? *Photius* and *Ignatius* and hundreds others? and *France*, about the Archbishops of *Rhemes*, when he was put out that deposed *Ludovicus* 4. and when an Infant was put in, and oft besides?

What if the *Alexandrians*, when *Athanasius* was banished by *Constantine* himself, were half for him, and half against him? Or *Basil* at *Cæsarea* was put down, and hundreds more; or when *Theodosius* first and second and *Martian*, and *Valentinian*, and *Zeno*, and *Anastasius* and abundance more, set up and pull'd down, and set up again against each other? What, I say, if the People now mistooke who had the best Title? Is this separating from the Catholick Church? When the *Interim* cast out hundreds in *Germany*; When *Ludovicus* cast out Multitudes in the *Palatinate*, and half the People stuck to the ejected, persecuted Pastor, and the rest to the Magistrates choice, which of them separated from the Universal Church? Is every Priest the *Universal Church*, or an *essential* part of it? then it dyeth when he dyeth, and Apostatizeth when he doth. How many Ages in above 23 Duplicates or Schisms, was the World uncertain which was the true Pope? suppose, *e. g. Arthur Jackson*, *Edmund Calamy*, and many such were placed in their Incumbency, by the Bishops, Patrons and Parish consent, according to the Law of Christ and the Land, and by a new Act of Uniformity they be all turned out, the Flock not consenting, nor any Bishop accusing, trying or deposing them (save in Legislation,) and some of the Parish think this dissolveth not their Relation to him, and they cleave to him as before, without any change save of Place and Tythes, and others forsake such a one, and follow the Magistrates choice, may not both these be still of the Catholick Church? If not, I know where the old Canons laid the charge and danger. It's wonderful selfishness in those men, that if they can but get into the Seat, take it for granted, that all must own their right on pain of Damnation.

And what if in any such Land, the Prince change his mind, or the next differ,

differ, and put down all these same men, and set up such as differ from them more than we do, is it damning Schism for any of their People still to adhere to them?

LXXXIX. Do you find that Mr. *Dodwel*, Dr. *Saywel*, Dr. *Sherlock*, or any of these men, do, in Pulpit and Press, ingenuously tell the People the truth of the Case, when they liken men as Schismaticks to Murderers for danger? Did you ever hear them say, [*The Canon, which is the Churches Voice and Law, doth Excommunicate you all that do own your Opinions against Conformity, and commandeth us not to admit you to the Sacrament, and yet to pronounce your Excommunication for not taking it: We confess they have been holy and Learned Men that have thought many things imposed unlawful; and therefore we wonder not if it be not in your power to change your judgment, no more than to be perfect in knowledge; and we confess if you are unjustly Excommunicated, or any of the things made necessary to Communion be against Gods Word, then it is the Church that is guilty of Schism, but because this is not so, we accuse you of Schism,* even of *separating from the Universal Church, and from Salvation.*

XC. I do admire, that never any one of them would be prevail'd with to prove the Canons Excommunications *ipso facto* lawful, when even Papists have scorn'd all such doings; and when the learnedst of all their own admired men, that were for comprimising matters with *Rome*, even *Mar. Ant. de Dom. Spalatensis de Rep. Eccl.* hath so confidently, copiously and strenuously damn'd it: Christ would have none Excommunicate, whatever the Crime be, without Impenitency after due admonition for Repentance, but these Canons *ipso facto* Condemn and Excommunicate Godly men, without ever admonishing them, or calling them to repent, or hearing or seeing them: Nothing is necessary but the proof of the fact, and then the Law is instead of a Judge; and to oblige the People to avoid them, it must be published.

If this and all things named in the first *Plea for Peace*, be sinless, studying and disputing is not the way to know what is sinful.

XCI. But, saith the Resolver, [*Christ hath but one Body, and to be a Member of two separate and Opposite Churches, is to be contrary to ourselves.*]

Ans. But I had hoped your Catechized Boyes had known, 1. That one Body hath many parts. 2. That particular Churches are parts of this Body, as Corporations are of the Kingdom. 3. That all the parts are imperfect, and made up of none but sinners. 4. That every good man is partly bad, and so contrary to himself. 5. That Churches may be so far *separate* as to be distinct, and yet not so far as to be *contrary* or opposite. 6. That they may be *opposite* in *Accidents* and *Integrals*, that are *one* in *specie* in *Essentials*. 7. That a man may own several Churches, and Communicate with them for that which they *agree in*, and yet not own both, (or *either* perhaps)

hath) in that which they are *oppoſite* in. 8. That there being *ſomewhat oppoſite* in *all men* and *Churches on Earth*, you damn your ſelves for Communicating with them. 9. That a man may have more Communion with the Church which he Locally *ſeparateth* from, even for ſin, than with that which he is preſent with.

E. g. A Congregation or Nation of men of eminent Sanctity and Order, found Doctrine and Worſhip, may, by humane frailty take ſome one falſehood or uncertain thing to be neceſſary to Miniſtry or Communion (as they ſay ſome Churches unhappily of late reject all that own not the Antiquity of the *Hebrew* Points) I cannot have local Communion with that Church, for they will not receive me, unleſs I ſubſcribe either a falſhood, (or that which I judge falſe;) but yet I highly honour and love them, and have mental Catholick Communion with them, when perhaps neceſſity may make me Locally join with a Church of far worſe men and Order, that will impoſe no ſin on me. 10. And I would adviſe theſe men, did they not deſpiſe my advice, for the Church of *Englands* ſake, and their own, to retract their Errours, and not lay ſuch a Snare before the People. Should you ſay in the Pulpit, [*If the Church be guilty of any Schiſm by her Impoſitions*, (oft-named) *Excommunications and ſilencing of Chriſts Miniſters, and afflicting good people without juſt Cauſe, then I, and all that communicate with it and me, communicate in the guilt of Schiſm*, and are all *in as much danger of Damnation by it as Adulterers and Murderers*] tell not your hearers this, for if you do, ſome will think you bid them *ſeparate* or be *damned*, and only make a doubt whether moſt men have Noſes or not.

XCII. *Qu. But is not the Inference true?*

Anſ. No, it's falſe: There are twenty caſes in which 1. One may be guilty of Schiſm and not be a Schiſmatick, as denominated from what predominateth: 2. And as many in which he is not at all guilty that communicateth with the guilty.

And let the world (that is ſober and awake) judge now whether theſe men or we be the greater Schiſmaticks, and which more condemneth or ſeparateth from the Church of *England*. We ſay that all Churches have ſome degree of Schiſm, and ſo hath the Church of *England*, as it hath imperfection, Errour and Sin; but that it is not therefore *no Church*, nor is it unlawful to communicate with it; All Chriſtians and Churches muſt not be ſeparated from that are guilty of ſome degree of Schiſm.

If any will turn theſe Serious matters into Jeſt, and ſay, as Dr. *Saywell*, that they will receive *Greeks*, *Lutherans*, &c. that come to their Communion, his Serious Readers will tell him, that ſo will moſt Sects receive

thoſe

thoſe that approve of their Communion and come to them: Joyning with you ſignifyeth that they are of your way therein; But will you go to *their Churches* and *Communicate* with them? You will receive the damned Schiſmaticks if they come to you, when yet you make it damnable to joyn in their meetings with them. This quibbling beſeems not grave men in great matters.

To conclude, Reader, God having allowed more Legiſlative Power to men in things *Secular* than in Religion, I may ſay this caſe is like ours in debate.

I. Some Judges and Lawyers ſay, that the Oath of Allegiance makes a Subject in this Kingdom; that the *Renouncing* or Violating it by *Treaſon*, or *Rebellion*, or *deſerting the Kingdom*, overthrows the Relation. But that other particular faults or quarrels againſt Neighbours, Juſtices, Judges, yea the King himſelf, are puniſhable according to the Laws, but are not all Rebellion, nor diſſolve Subjection, nor oblige the Subjects to renounce civil converſe with each other; though ſome contempt and obſtinacy may outlaw them. Such is our Judgment of Church Relation and Communion, which I need not rehearſe.

II. Suppoſe a ſect of Lawyers and Judges ariſe, that ſay, no men are the Kings Subjects, but are Rebels, that break any of his Laws, that Shoot not in long Bows, that Bury not their dead in Wooilen, that ſwear prophanely, that eat fleſh in *Lent* unlicenſed, that have any unjuſt Law-Suit, that wrong any Neighbour, that oppreſs any Poor man, all theſe are Rebels; yea all that plead oppoſite Cauſes at the Bar, and all Judges that judge contrary to one another, and all that miſunderſtand any point of Law and Practice accordingly, and all that beſides the Oath of Allegiance do conſtitute Marriages, Families, Schools, Societyes by any other Covenants of their own, and all that are of different Cities and Companies, parts of the Kingdom, or all whoſe Juſtices, Mayors, Sheriffs, *&c.* differ from one another in any point of Law and practice: Or all that obey not every Conſtable and Juſtice; or that go to divers Juſtices in the ſame Precincts, or that go from one Juſtice to another to avoid unrighteous Judgment, or that go from the Phyſician of the Place for Health, and from the Schoolmaſter of the Town for greater edification, or that Travel beyond Sea for Knowledge, yea all that underſtand not every word in the Law, that may concern them: If any ſay, none of theſe are the Kings Subjects, but Rebels, oppoſite to him and one another, and deſerve to be all hang'd as Murderers, and ſo are all that have Communion with them; *Quære*, 1. Whether theſe men are for the Unity of *England*? 2. And are Friends to the King that deprive him of all his Subjects; as much as thoſe that would have him have no Subjects, that be not of the ſame Age, Stature, Complexion and Wit. 3. And whether they are Friends to Mankind? 4. And whether they

condemn not themſelves if they live not as Anchorets, out of humane Society. 5. And whether that Nation be not by infatuation prepared for Deſtruction that would believe them, and would hate, ſcorn and ruine them that are of the firſt mentioned opinion, according to the ſaying, *Quos perdere vult Jupiter, hos dementat.*

As to the more dangerous Doctrine now threatning this Land, that would ſubject *England* to a Foreign Juriſdiction, on pretence of a Neceſſity of either an Univerſal Church Monarch, or Church-Parliament Senate or Council, or of all the Church on Earth repreſented by Patriarchs or Metropolitans, or that plead for *Subjection to them*, under the Name of Communion, they require a diſtinct Anſwer. But Dr. *Iſ. Barrow*, and Mr. *Beverley's* Catholick Catechiſm, have effectually done it.

FINIS.

D
B 1206

228987

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION